

R E P O R T

AND

SPECIAL REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND

APPENDIX.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed
19 July 1904.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
By WYMAN & SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, E.C.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE, EAST HARDING STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C.; and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH; or
E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1904.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

[15th April 1904]:—Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill,—read a second time and committed to a Select Committee.

[8th June 1904]:—Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill,—The Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill was *nominated* of,—Mr. Barran, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Field, Mr. Ernest Gray, Dr. Hutchinson, Captain Jessel, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Grant Lawson, Mr. A. K. Loyd, Mr. Price, Mr. Spear, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Edward Strachey, Sir Mark Stewart, and Mr. Austin Taylor.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.

[27th June 1904]:—*Ordered*, That Mr. Barran be discharged from the Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill; and that Captain Ellice be added to the Committee.

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welMOmec
Call	+
No.	
	WA 705
	1904
	G78r

SPECIAL REPORT	- - - - -	p. iii
REPORT	- - - - -	p. v
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE	- - - - -	p. vii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	- - - - -	p. 1
APPENDIX	- - - - -	p. 107

SPECIAL REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE, to whom the TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL was referred;—HAVE agreed to the following SPECIAL REPORT :

1. APART from any question of the indirect effect upon the trade in meat of the present law and practice with regard to the seizure and condemnation of carcases of animals on account of tuberculosis, your Committee do not think that serious pecuniary loss is inflicted at present by such seizure and condemnation upon butchers who deal in high-class meat, the vast majority of carcases seized being those of old dairy cows. The loss in respect of such cows is considerable, but the butcher who deals in them takes the probability of that loss into consideration in fixing the price he gives for them.

With regard to pigs, your Committee have received evidence that serious loss from seizures falls upon butchers slaughtering home-bred animals. Several witnesses have complained that the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis that “the presence of tubercular deposit in any degree should involve seizure of the whole carcase” of a pig is too stringent, especially in view of the fact that the detection of tuberculosis in imported pigs is rendered exceedingly difficult by their importation without their heads and neck-glands.

2. Your Committee have considered the question whether butchers can meet the risk of seizure by insurance at reasonable rates, and have had their attention drawn, both by witnesses called before them and by reference to the evidence given before the Royal Commission, to systems of mutual insurance against this risk existing in various towns and in certain auction marts.

It appears to your Committee that the difficulty which stands in the way of the general adoption of a system of mutual insurance is the variety of practice which at present exists with regard to the amount of tubercular deposit, the existence of which in a carcase is held to justify its total condemnation. They recommend that power should be given to the appropriate central authority in England, Scotland and Ireland, respectively, to enforce uniformity in this matter upon all local authorities.

If such uniformity were enforced butchers would be able to insure themselves from loss by seizure on account of tuberculosis, at reasonable rates, in the case of animals presenting a healthy appearance before slaughter, and for which a fair price for the purpose of human food had been given.

3. Your Committee, however, do not think that the case of the butchers would be entirely met by provisions facilitating mutual, or other, insurance.

In the present condition of scientific knowledge upon the subject, it is impossible to lay down any regulations for the partial or total condemnation of carcases on account of tuberculosis which may not involve the destruction of some meat which might have been used with impunity for human food. In such cases the caution which may be rightly used in the interests of the community inflicts on the butcher unnecessary loss.

It has also been urged upon your Committee that the fact that the butcher bears at present the whole of the risk of seizure is a strong inducement to meat traders to deal in foreign meat, which was stated by several witnesses to be less liable to condemnation than the meat of home-bred animals.

There appears also to be considerable force in the argument used by the witnesses called on behalf of the Butchers' Federation that the prospect of heavy loss falling entirely upon himself is a strong temptation to a butcher to attempt to conceal the fact that he has upon his premises meat of the complete freedom of which from tuberculosis he may himself be doubtful.

4. Your Committee fear that if the butchers were relieved from the whole of the loss arising from seizures, the caution exercised by them in purchasing animals for slaughter might be relaxed, but they do not think that it would be unreasonable to provide that, subject to certain conditions, a proportion of the loss should fall upon the public, and they recommend that that proportion should be fixed at one-half.

5. The conditions upon which such assistance from public funds should be granted appear to your Committee to be :—

That the butcher claiming assistance should prove to the satisfaction of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction (1) that he bought the animal for slaughter in good faith, as a sound animal fit for human food; (2) that at the time of purchase it exhibited no visible signs of tuberculosis; (3) that the price he paid for it was a fair market price for an animal of its class and weight free from tuberculosis; and (4) that he gave notice to the Local Authority at the earliest time reasonably possible after he became aware of the fact that he had upon his premises a carcase affected with tuberculosis.

Your Committee do not recommend that this assistance should be given in the case of animals or meat imported into the United Kingdom.

6. The butchers who gave evidence complained more of the injury to members of their trade caused by prosecution in open Court for having tuberculous meat upon their premises than of the direct pecuniary loss caused by seizures of such meat.

It appears to your Committee that, if a butcher being in possession of such meat has notified the fact to the proper Authority as soon as he could be reasonably expected to be aware of it, the case should not be taken into Court. This appears to be the rule in many places, but not universally throughout the United Kingdom.

If aid from public funds is given upon the suggested conditions, the butcher, upon whose premises tuberculous meat has been seized, should have in all cases the opportunity of proving in open Court, in substantiating his claim for assistance, that he acted throughout in good faith, had no reason to suspect that he was bringing a tuberculous animal into his premises, and made no attempt to conceal the fact of its presence there as soon as it came to his knowledge.

7. Your Committee have also considered the question of the fund from which the limited assistance they suggest should be drawn.

It is manifestly unfair to the ratepayers of the great collecting and distributing centres that they should bear this burden.

If the charge is to be made upon local funds, it would appear to be more just that it should be imposed upon the locality in which the animal contracted or developed tuberculosis. Your Committee, however, think that the difficulty of tracing each animal in respect to which a claim is made to such locality makes the adoption of this method of distribution of the charge practically impossible.

For these reasons your Committee recommend that such assistance to butchers as they suggest should be provided by the Imperial Exchequer.

R E P O R T.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE, to whom the TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS)
COMPENSATION BILL was referred ;—HAVE agreed to report the same,
without Amendment.

19 July 1904.

R E P O R T

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WHOM THE DISSENTING (1847)

(Continued) THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WHOM THE DISSENTING (1847)

1847-1848

1847-1848

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Tuesday, 14th June 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Barran.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Grant Lawson.

Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

Mr. Grant Lawson was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Committee meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays at Three o'clock"—(Mr. *Ernest Gray*).

Amendment proposed to leave out the word "Three" and insert the word "Twelve"—(D *Farquharson*)—instead thereof.—Question put, That the word "Three" stand part of the Question.—The Committee divided :

Ayes, 5.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Mark Stewart.

Noes, 6.
Mr. Barran.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Spear.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

Question put, That the word "Twelve" be there inserted.—The Committee divided :

Ayes, 10.
Mr. Barran.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

No, 1.
Mr. Field.

Main Question as amended, put :—

Resolved, "That the Committee meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays at Twelve o'clock."

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, June 21st, at Twelve o'clock.]

Tuesday, 21st June 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. GRANT LAWSON, in the Chair.

Mr. Barran,
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.

Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

The Committee deliberated.

Mr. *William Coggan* and Mr. *William Cooper* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, June 23rd, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 23rd June, 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON in the Chair.

Dr. Farquharson.	Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. Field.	Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Ernest Gray.	Mr. Spear.
Dr. Hutchinson.	Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Captain Jessel.	Sir Mark Stewart.

Mr. *Thomas Webster*, Mr. *William Ramsden*, Mr. *Fred Redman* and Mr. *Robert Brechin* were examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, June 28th, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 28th June, 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.	Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Dr. Farquharson.	Mr. Price.
Mr. Field.	Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Mr. Ernest Gray.	Sir Mark Stewart.
Dr. Hutchinson.	Mr. Austin Taylor.
Captain Jessel.	

Bailie *W. F. Anderson*, Mr. *James A. Baxter*, Dr. *Matthew Hay*, and Mr. *Shirley Murphy* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, June 30th, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 30th June, 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.	Mr. Price.
Dr. Farquharson.	Mr. Spear.
Mr. Ernest Gray.	Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Dr. Hutchinson.	Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Kilbride.	Mr. Austin Taylor.

Mr. *Andrew Beveridge*, Dr. *E. W. Hope*, Mr. *Francis Henry Edwards*, Mr. *Andrew E. Kessen* and Dr. *James R. Kaye* were examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, July 5th, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 5th July, 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.	Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Dr. Farquharson.	Mr. Spear.
Mr. Field.	Sir Edward Strachey.
Mr. Ernest Gray.	Sir Mark Stewart.
Dr. Hutchinson.	Mr. Austin Taylor.
Mr. Kilbride.	

Dr. *R. Sydney Marsden* and Dr. *Francis Vacher* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, July 7th, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday 7th July 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON, in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. Kilbride.

Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.

Dr. Henry O'Neill, Mr. Andrew Watson, Mr. James King and Mr. George Patrick Terrett were examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, July 12th, at Three o'clock]

Tuesday, July 12th 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON, in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.

Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

The Committee deliberated.

Resolution of the Committee of June 14th, relative to the hour of meeting, read and rescinded.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, July 19th, at Three o'clock.]

Tuesday, July 19th 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. GRANT LAWSON, in the Chair.

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. Price.

Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

DRAFT SPECIAL REPORT proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read the first time, as follows:—

"1. Apart from any question of the indirect effect upon the trade in meat of the present law and practice with regard to the seizure and condemnation of carcasses of animals on account of tuberculosis, your Committee do not think that serious pecuniary loss is inflicted at present by such seizure and condemnation upon butchers who deal in high-class meat, the vast majority of carcasses seized being those of old dairy cows. The loss in respect of such cows is considerable, but the butcher who deals in them takes the probability of that loss into consideration in fixing the price he gives for them.

"With regard to pigs, your Committee have received evidence that serious loss from seizures falls upon butchers slaughtering home-bred animals. Several witnesses have complained that the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis that "the presence of tubercular deposit in any degree should involve seizure of the whole carcass" of a pig is too stringent.

"2. Your Committee have considered the question whether butchers can meet the risk of seizure by insurance at reasonable rates, and have had their attention drawn, both by witnesses called before them and by reference to the evidence given before the Royal Commission, to systems of mutual insurance against this risk existing in various towns and in certain auction marts.

"It appears to your Committee that the difficulty which stands in the way of the general adoption of a system of mutual insurance is the variety of practice which at present exists with regard to the amount of tubercular deposit, the existence of which in a carcase is held to justify its total condemnation. They recommend that power should be given to the appropriate central authority in England, Scotland and Ireland, respectively, to enforce uniformity in this matter upon all local authorities.

"If such uniformity were enforced butchers would be able to insure themselves from loss by seizure on account of tuberculosis, at reasonable rates, in the case of animals presenting a healthy appearance before slaughter, and for which a fair price for the purpose of human food had been given.

"3. Your Committee, however, do not think that the case of the butchers would be entirely met by provisions facilitating mutual, or other, insurance.

"In the present condition of scientific knowledge upon the subject, it is impossible to lay down any regulations for the partial or total condemnation of carcasses on account of tuberculosis which may not involve the destruction of some meat which might have been used with impunity for human food. In such cases the caution which may be rightly used in the interests of the community inflicts on the butcher unnecessary loss.

"It has also been urged upon your Committee that the fact that the butcher bears at present the whole of the risk of seizure is a strong inducement to meat traders to deal in foreign meat, which was stated by several witnesses to be less liable to seizure than the meat of home-bred animals.

"There appears also to be considerable force in the argument used by the witnesses called on behalf of the Butchers' Federation that the prospect of heavy loss falling entirely upon himself is a strong temptation to a butcher to attempt to conceal the fact that he has upon his premises meat of the complete freedom of which from tuberculosis he may himself be doubtful.

"4. Your Committee fear that if the butchers were relieved from the whole of the loss arising from seizures, the caution exercised by them in purchasing animals for slaughter might be relaxed, but they do not think that it would be unreasonable to provide that, subject to certain conditions a proportion of the loss should fall upon the public, and they recommend that that proportion should be fixed at one-half.

"5. The conditions upon which such assistance from public funds should be granted appear to your Committee to be:—

"That the butcher claiming assistance should prove to the satisfaction of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction (1) that he bought the animal for slaughter in good faith, as a sound animal; (2) that at the time of purchase it exhibited no visible signs of tuberculosis; (3) that the price he paid for it was a fair market price for an animal of its class and weight free from tuberculosis; and (4) that he gave notice to the Local Authority at the earliest time reasonably possible after he became aware of the fact that he had upon his premises a carcase affected with tuberculosis.

"6. The butchers who gave evidence complained more of the injury to members of their trade caused by prosecution in open Court for having tuberculous meat upon their premises than of the direct pecuniary loss caused by seizures of such meat.

"It appears to your Committee that, if a butcher being in possession of such meat has notified the fact to the proper Authority as soon as he could be reasonably expected to be aware of it, the case should not be taken into Court. This appears to be the rule in many places, but not universally throughout the United Kingdom.

"If aid from public funds is given upon the suggested conditions, the butcher, upon whose premises tuberculous meat has been seized, will have in all cases the opportunity of proving in open Court, in substantiating his claim for assistance, that he acted throughout in good faith, had no reason to suspect that he was bringing a tuberculous animal into his premises, and made no attempt to conceal the fact of its presence there as soon as it came to his knowledge.

"7. Your Committee have also considered the question of the fund from which the limited assistance they suggest should be drawn.

"It is manifestly unfair to the ratepayers of the great collecting and distributing centres that they should bear this burden.

"If the charge is to be made upon local funds, it would appear to be more just that it should be imposed upon the locality in which the animal contracted or developed tuberculosis. Your Committee, however, think that the difficulty of tracing each animal in respect to which a claim is made to such locality makes the adoption of this method of distribution of the charge practically impossible.

"For these reasons your Committee recommend that such assistance to butchers as they suggest should be provided by the Imperial Exchequer."

Question, That the Draft Special Report proposed by the *Chairman*, be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph,—put, and agreed to.

Paragraph 1:

Amendment proposed, in line 3, to leave out the words "serious pecuniary," and insert the word "the"—(Mr. *Ernest Gray*)—instead thereof.—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.	Noes, 2.
Captain Ellice.	Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Farquharson.	Sir Mark Stewart.
Dr. Hutchinson.	
Captain Jessel.	
Mr. Price.	
Mr. Spear.	
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell,	
Sir Edward Strachey.	

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words "It having been proved to your Committee that the removal of the pig's head in many cases prevents the detection of the fact that the pig before slaughter was affected with tuberculosis, they would recommend that pigs from whose bodies the heads have been removed should not be allowed to be imported from abroad"—(Sir *Edward Strachey*)—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 4.	Noes, 7.
Mr. Ernest Gray.	Captain Ellice.
Captain Jessel.	Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Spear.	Dr. Hutchinson.
Sir Edward Strachey.	Mr. Price.
	Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
	Sir Mark Stewart.
	Mr. Austin Taylor.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words, "especially in view of the fact that the detection of tuberculosis in infected pigs is rendered exceedingly difficult by their importation without their heads and neck glands"—(The *Chairman*).

Question, That those words be there added, put and *agreed to*.

Paragraph as amended *agreed to*.

Paragraph 2 *agreed to*.

Paragraph 3 amended and *agreed to*.

Paragraph 4 *agreed to*.

Paragraph 5:

Amendment proposed, in line 5, after the word "animal" to insert the words "fit for human food."—(Mr. *Austin Taylor*).

Question, That those words be there inserted, put and *agreed to*.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words "Your Committee do not recommend that this assistance should be given in the case of animals for meat imported into the United Kingdom."—(The *Chairman*.)

Question, That those words be there added, put and *agreed to*.

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 6 amended and *agreed to*.

Paragraph 7:

Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "centres" to insert the words "the sanitary condition of whose shippens or milk sheds are often much in advance of those of the adjacent rural districts."—(Mr. *Austin Taylor*.)

Question proposed, That those words be there inserted.

Amendment by leave *withdrawn*.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words "But in cases where the animals can be traced back to the district where they contracted or

developed tuberculosis, the sum granted by way of compensation should be a debt recoverable from the Local Authority for that district, unless it can be shown that proper precautions have been taken to prevent the spread of tuberculosis.”—(Mr. *Ernest Gray*).

Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided :

Ayes, 4.
Captain Ellice.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Mr. Price.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

Noes, 6.
Dr. Farquharson.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. Spear.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.

Paragraph 7 *agreed to*.

Question, That this Report, as amended, be the Special Report of the Committee to the House, put, and *agreed to*.

Ordered, To report the Bill, without Amendment, to the House, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME OF WITNESS.	Profession or Condition.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home under Orders of Committee.	Allowance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Thomas Webster - -	Wholesale Meat Sales- man	Glasgow - - -	3	3 3 -	5 18 3	8 18 3
William Ramsden - -	Wholesale Butcher -	Liverpool - - -	2	3 1 -	2 2 -	5 3 -
Robert Brechin - -	Butcher - - -	Glasgow - - -	3	3 3 -	5 18 3	8 18 3
James Anderson Baxter	Superintendent of Mar- kets	Dundee - - -	3	3 3 -	6 11 3	9 14 3
Matthew Hay - -	Medical Officer of Health	Aberdeen - - -	4	4 4 -	7 1 6	11 5 6
E. W. Hope - - -	Medical Officer of Health	Liverpool - - -	2	2 2 -	3 2 -	5 4 -
Francis Henry Edwards	Superintendent of Mar- kets	Birmingham - -	2	2 2 -	1 19 -	4 1 -
Andrew Emerson Kessen	Gentleman - - -	Hull - - -	4	4 4 -	5 5 8	9 9 -
James Robert Kaye -	Medical Officer of Health	Wakefield - - -	2	2 2 -	2 13 2	4 15 2
Robert Sydney Marsden	Medical Officer of Health	Birkenhead - - -	2	2 2 -	3 3 -	5 5 -
Francis Vacher - -	Medical Officer of Health	Birkenhead - - -	2	2 2 -	3 3 -	5 5 -
Henry O'Neill - -	Consulting Surgeon -	Belfast - - -	3	£ 6 -	4 15 6	11 1 6
Andrew Watson - -	Borough Veterinary Inspector	Dublin - - -	3	3 3 -	4 9 6	7 12 6
				TOTAL - - -	£.	96 12 5

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Tuesday, 21st June 1904.

	PAGE
Mr. William Coggan - - - - -	1
Mr. William Cooper - - - - -	9

Thursday, 23rd June 1904.

Mr. Thomas Webster - - - - -	15
Mr. William Ramsden - - - - -	23
Alderman Redman - - - - -	28
Mr. Robert Brechin - - - - -	30

Tuesday, 28th June 1904.

Bailie William Fleming Anderson, J.P. - - - - -	33
Mr. James Anderson Baxter - - - - -	44
Professor Matthew Hay, M.D. - - - - -	46
Mr. Shirley Murphy - - - - -	52

Thursday, 30th June 1904.

Mr. Andrew Beveridge - - - - -	56
Dr. Edward William Hope - - - - -	56
Mr. Francis Henry Edwards - - - - -	62
Mr. Andrew Emerson Kessen - - - - -	64
Dr. James Robert Kaye - - - - -	66

Tuesday, 5th July 1904.

Dr. Robert Sidney Marsden - - - - -	68
Dr. Francis Vacher - - - - -	77

Thursday, 7th July 1904.

Mr. Henry O'Neill, M.D., J.P. - - - - -	80
Mr. Andrew Watson, M.R.C.V.S. - - - - -	91
Mr. James King - - - - -	95
Mr. George Patrick Terrett - - - - -	101

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Tuesday, 21st June 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Barran.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.

Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

MR. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. WILLIAM COGGAN, called ; and Examined.

Chairman.

Chairman—continued.

1. You are in business in London, are you not?—Yes.

2. Are you an ex-President of the National Federation of Meat Traders Associations, a member of the Examiners Board of the Sanitary Institute and Managing Director, and Chairman of Lidstone, Limited, and a member of the Council of the Smithfield Club?—I am.

3. In those capacities have you heard frequent complaints of the seizure of beasts without compensation?—I have.

4. This Committee does not propose to go into the question of whether those seizures were justifiable or not ; the question before the Committee is that on the meat being seized on whom the loss should fall, so you will please keep your attention to that point. As one case of hardship, can you quote a case of your own personal knowledge connected with Lidstone, Limited?—Yes.

5. Will you tell the Committee your own personal experience?—I have a photograph of the carcase of an animal which was slightly affected in some of the internal organs.

6. That is on the point of whether it ought to have been condemned or not, is it not?—Yes, that will show the hardship of the whole case. As far as confiscation goes, what more particularly our trade feel they are suffering so seriously from, is the publicity which is given to the seizures and consequently the injury done, to say nothing of the enormous loss which it entails as well. In this case, that bullock was purchased from Sir Hugh Adair, in Norfolk, and weighed 114 stone and was really a fine animal. It was worth about £26. That animal was found after being killed to be suffering, or had suffered, from tuberculosis. There was a small

0.16.

portion of one of the lobes of the liver and one of the lungs slightly infected, and the Inspector, who at that time really lived in our slaughter house, because he had been newly appointed to the post and wanted to learn his business, seeing something a little unusual sent for the medical officer, and as the result the medical officer said “ we must have the whole carcase sent down to be destroyed.”

7. Was it destroyed?—No, sir ; that is the point. I had just been elected President of the Federation, and though I felt to make this public would very likely injure us in our business, I considered I had a public duty to perform. I was confident from the slight way in which the animal was affected, it was not fit that the carcase should be condemned, and I said I should contest the matter. I sent for two veterinary surgeons, Professor Pemberthy and Mr. Pritchard, and also Mr. King who confirmed my views on the subject, with the result that the medical officer of health finally relented, and in fact gave me a certificate saying, though he had made the seizure he returned the carcase as being fit for food.

8. That was not a case which would come under the Bill, because it was not condemned, was it?—But that is one instance where the trade has felt it so seriously, because men have allowed carcasses to be taken away rather than it should be known bad meat was suspected to have been on their premises.

9. How long have you been in your business?—30 years.

10. How many beasts a-year do you suppose you have had through your hands? We are killing about 20 beasts a week

A

11. In

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

Chairman—continued.

11. In your whole experience of over 30 years how many beasts have you had condemned?—I do not know that I have had one wholly condemned myself, but I want to show you the point; in oxen the disease is very rare, but in cows I know of a young man who has not been in business many years who has had 50 seized.

12. If you buy a cow I suppose you consider the fact that it is more liable to be diseased?—Yes.

13. And you would therefore offer a less price for it, would you not?—I should imagine a man would do so, but of course there is a market price for a cow.

14. Have you had some cases from Newcastle which you have presented in a tabulated form through Mr. Field?—Yes, through Mr. Long. The society in Newcastle which had been suffering very much sent me a tabulated form giving me the names, dates and prices as to animals which had been seized, and as far as my memory serves, the amount involved was something like 1,400*l.* in two years and a-half.

15. Do you know anything about the Mutual Insurance Company amongst butchers in Newcastle?—Yes.

16. Would you think this a surprising statement as coming from them: "The Association have insured 60,724 cattle of all classes, of which 104 have been destroyed at a cost to the society of 4*d.* per head insured"?—I should not like to accept that statement, because I know as a fact there has been great dissatisfaction amongst the men at Newcastle with regard to the insurance question. Those who have been killing oxen have found that a shilling a piece would cover all their loss, and I think their actual subscription has been half-a-crown each animal.

17. Are you quite sure of that?—That is what I have been told, and they have had to make a further levy of eighteen pence per head to meet the losses on the cows. I do not know how far your period extends, because 60,000 cattle in Newcastle would cover a long period.

18. Is there a Newcastle man in the room?—There is not. I know the medical officer of Newcastle who is one of the examiners of our Board, and he takes the view that if there is a speck on the carcase as large as a shilling he should condemn an entire carcase, which is entirely contrary to the recommendation of the Royal Commission.

19. Do you know of your own knowledge, what the subscription to the insurance is at Newcastle?—I understand the subscription was half-a-crown a head, and that does not cover the case of cows.

20. I dare say we shall have a witness from Newcastle who can tell us, because before Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission the rules of the Association were put in, and it appeared that the subscription was one shilling for an ox and eighteen pence for a cow, and in the first year there was returned 80 per cent. of the subscriptions?—They could do it on oxen, but as far as I am given to understand, on the cows they had to make a further levy. I am rather disposed to think that since then the inspection has been more severe

Chairman—continued.

21. That may be so. Do you wish to bring before the Committee a case of great hardship from King's Lynn?—Yes.

22. Was that a case of dispute about whether a carcase ought to be condemned or not?—Not at all. It was a case in which a number of bullocks being sent from one of the markets in Norfolk to some centre in Yorkshire, and at a station near King's Lynn it was discovered that one of the bullocks was down in the truck. The railway officials telegraphed to King's Lynn, to ask the station master there to get a trolley to take the bullock away and have it slaughtered. It was about 11 o'clock at night when they got the bullock to the slaughter-house. The butcher never saw the bullock but merely did as the railway people asked him to do. I suppose the King's Lynn people or the police thought there was something wrong. They went to the sanitary inspector and found that the body was very much affected with tuberculosis. The butcher was summoned for having it on his premises, and although the railway people gave evidence that it was their ox, and never suggested that the butcher should purchase it, but was acting as their servant, he was fined 10*l.* and costs. We thought it a hard case and the railway people and we together took the case to appeal, but the conviction was confirmed. I think we had to pay 200*l.* or 300*l.* together over it. That is the state of the law which has brought us to this position, so we ask for an alteration in it.

Sir Mark Stewart.

23. Where was the case tried—in the County Court?—No, it was a criminal prosecution.

24. Was it tried at the Assizes?—First of all it was tried before the magistrates, and then taken to the Quarter Sessions.

25. Do I understand you to say that at Newcastle the rate of insurance was half-a-crown in the case of a cow, or was it eighteen pence in addition to that amount?—As I understand it they pay so much per head for every animal they kill. If it was a cow they would pay so much, if it was an ox they would pay so much: and on the amount paid for the oxen there was a fair return at the end of the year, but on the amount paid for the cows they had to make a further levy. I understood it was a shilling for oxen and two-and-six for cows, but I may be wrong.

26. Speaking as having a very large connection in London, you cannot complain personally of the state of the law, I understand?—Personally I do not. I am sent here as representing the trade and the Federation, and we have felt that what one bears the others should share in.

27. Do you happen to know many cases of hardship throughout the country?—Yes, all over the place—Reading, Exeter, and everywhere.

28. Would you say the cases were more frequent in the country than in London?—Much more.

29. Why is that?—There are more heifers and cows killed in the country districts than there are in London.

30. Do.

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray.

30. Do I understand that you allege that no test can be applied with hope of satisfactory result, when you are purchasing in the market?—That is so; we do not know of any, or have ever heard of any; the test must be applied when the animal is perfectly quiet.

31. You are limiting your claim, are you, to cases in which carcases of animals are seized, which, when alive, were believed to be thoroughly sound?—That is so. This agitation has been going on for many years, and we have always asked in applying to the Government, that there should not be any compensation for animals which showed any signs of disease, but that 8*l.* should be the lowest price we should ask for.

32. Do you further suggest in the Bill referred to this Committee, that it should be proved to the satisfaction of the magistrate who hears the case that you had every reason to believe the animal was in perfectly sound condition when you purchased it?—Certainly.

33. Do you suggest that if authorities that condemned carcases, and seized and destroyed them, were afterwards called upon to compensate butchers for the loss, greater care would be exercised by the local authority with regard to those seizures. Let me put it to you in this way: you have already told the Committee that in some districts it is the practice to seize the whole carcase, have you not?—Yes.

34. And to destroy it?—Yes.

35. Is it the case that in other districts the recommendation of the Royal Commission is carried out, and that the portions affected only are seized and destroyed?—Yes.

36. Do I understand that one of your suggestions is that there should be uniformity of practice throughout the country?—Certainly.

37. Do I understand from you that if a local authority had to pay 28*l.* compensation (taking the case you have just quoted) for a carcase destroyed entirely, they would be more disposed to adopt the report of the Commission, and and simply destroy the portion affected, and thus decrease the amount of compensation payable?—We think that would be the natural tendency. Unfortunately, the the recommendations of the Royal Commission are only recommendations, and it is left to the discretion of the medical officer to act as he pleases.

38. Then there would be a penalty attaching to a local authority which went unnecessarily beyond the recommendations of the Royal Commission, would there not?—In that case there would be.

39. If you sought to compensate yourselves by a system of mutual insurance that penalty would not exist, would it?—Certainly not.

40. That is to say you would bear by means of an insurance fund the whole of the financial loss, and the local authority could at will increase that loss by seizing as freely as they thought fit all affected carcases, and destroying the whole of them?—Certainly.

41. And you would bear the loss, would you?—Certainly.

42. Do I understand that you represent that that position is exceedingly unfair?—Yes.

0.16.

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

43. That is to say, you have the public authority responsible for the seizure, responsible for violating the recommendation of the Royal Commission, destroying the whole of the carcase, and then, as I understand, suggesting to you that you should mutually insure yourselves?—That is what they say.

44. That is the attitude, is it, so far as you understand, that the local authorities take up?—Some of the local authorities, we have many who quite agree that it is a matter which should be taken up publicly.

45. Have you any personal experience of mutual insurance societies for this purpose?—I have no actual experience. I know of this one in Newcastle, and I know of one also at Exeter, where they have not made an actual payment for each animal killed; but they have mutually agreed to meet the expenditure amongst themselves.

46. Your Federation then has had considerable information and experience of these insurance societies, has it not?—Yes, all these things come before us at our meetings.

47. While you might work out the average loss sustainable through disease, may I take it you could hardly work out the average loss occurring through the action of an inspector, very vigorous in his methods of procedure, as against the action of one who had been lax; that would destroy your insurance fund, would it not?—Yes, entirely. You see there are large districts where there are no inspectors at all. In fact, I do not know of any inspection of meat this side of King's Lynn, coming up to London.

48. Do you think this grievance could be removed by a system of mutual insurance?—I do not.

49. Why?—Because while it is left entirely in the hands of a medical officer to do as he likes, we could not insure against that. In some places there would be any amount condemned and in others none at all, and men in the latter case would say "Why should we contribute."

50. You lose the carcase when it is seized, do you not?—Yes.

51. No matter how slightly affected?—Yes.

52. You also lose the market, do you not?—Yes, and that would be a very serious matter to some men—to men, perhaps, in country districts.

53. That is to say, they have offended their customers?—Not that they have offended their customers, but that they could not get a supply.

54. And the butcher loses his reputation very largely through that, does he not?—That is the point.

55. Do you think the officials of local authorities would be more careful in these matters if financial responsibility were attached to them?—I think so, indeed.

56. And that is really one of the suggestions you make through this Bill, is it not?—Yes. There are so many animals destroyed now; in fact, this very morning I was speaking to the Chief Inspector in the Meat Market and he said "I have condemned three pigs this morning." They were actually killed in the Cattle Market, but passed inspection, so slightly were they infected. They were all three condemned although

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

although they were beautiful pigs. The inspector had to do it for the reason that in London the Corporation have appointed meat inspectors (I do not want to say anything disrespectful against the meat inspectors) who try to discover every case they can. Only a few weeks ago there were six or seven cases in one district in London where several pigs had been discovered slightly infected; they did not summon the retailer, but they summoned the wholesale man for selling them to the retailer, and in one case at which I was present the charge was dismissed.

57. From your knowledge of the markets, is it at all possible to trace an animal back and ascertain the seller, so that, assuming compensation were allowable, some portion would be paid by the district from which the animal came?—Generally speaking, that could be done. The majority of cattle which come to the markets come direct from the farms, or are bought by dealers so that you can trace them.

58. In your judgment, in the great majority of cases it would be possible to trace them back, would it?—I think that as to nearly the whole of the animals which come to our markets in England it could be done; I am not so sure about the Irish cattle.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

59. Did you take the case in the Newcastle district as the hardest case you know of?—Yes, it was the hardest case, I believe at Glasgow they have been suffering very much for the last two or three years, but with the exception of Glasgow, Newcastle has been most severely dealt with.

60. I do not know whether you care to answer this question, but I understand you said in reply to Mr. Gray that you think the inspection, or rather the condemnation, has been carried rather far. Would you think if the inspection was reasonable, a Bill of this kind would not be necessary at all?—I think an alteration in the law is necessary, because we ought not to be considered to be criminals for having in our possession anything that is unsound. We buy an animal in the open market, believing it to be sound, and we cannot be prosecuted until we kill it. The farmer cannot be prosecuted for selling it to us knowing it to be unsound, but the moment we kill it we can be summoned for having it on our premises. That is the law which we want altered, and then on the other side we say we ought to be compensated if we have to surrender them.

Sir Edward Strachey.

61. You said that cows were more subject to tuberculosis. Do you mean cows that have had calves or do you include maiden heifers?—More particularly cows. We believe that tuberculosis in regard to cattle is very much brought about by the condition of their living and where they live, and that it is handed down very likely from the conditions of the byres where they have been fed and kept, where other cattle have had it before and the disease has been handed down.

62. Taking maiden heifers and steers, would there be more liability to tuberculosis in a maiden heifer?—I do not think there would be more in a maiden heifer than in an ox.

Sir Edward Strachey—continued.

63. You said you thought it would not be difficult to trace back ownership through dealers, but is it not the case that cattle change hands two or three times?—That is so, more particularly with regard to Ireland.

64. Is not that the case in this country?—Not generally so.

65. Is it not the case that dealers sometimes will keep animals for some considerable time before passing them on again?—That is so, but you can trace them still.

66. But if they kept them for some time, they would perhaps develop disease whilst in the hands of the dealer, would they not?—Yes, but I think you could trace them.

67. What would you say is the proportion of cattle bought direct from the farmers and not from dealers?—I should say the majority come through dealers, but in the case of the London market the dealers go into all the Norfolk districts and bring cattle straight up, and they rarely change hands again.

68. But the proportion is very small that is sold directly by the farmers to the butchers, I suppose?—That is so, especially in London; the country people go round and buy at farms.

Mr. Loyd.

69. Who first gave information to the police in the King's Lynn case?—I could not say, but it is believed the police saw the animals being killed; it was unusual to be slaughtering in the middle of the night, and the inspector was informed there was something going on in the slaughter-house.

70. So I gather that, rightly or wrongly, the magistrates were satisfied that the animal was being prepared for human food?—There is no doubt about that. The law provides that if it is so, we can be fined or imprisoned.

71. Is it not a necessary part of any criminal charge, that the carcase should be exposed or prepared for sale?—That should be so, but the law says, if we have it on our premises, the magistrate says "if you have dressed the animal in the ordinary way for food, then it is prepared for food."

72. If they are satisfied on the evidence that it was intended for food, they treat it as a criminal matter, do they?—Yes, that is so.

Dr. Hutchinson.

73. You have helped us a good deal by telling the Committee that the amount of tuberculosis in bullocks and heifers is so small that it need hardly be taken into consideration, so that it narrows the thing down to cows, does it not?—Chiefly so.

74. You personally, I understand, have had thousands of beasts through your hands, but you cannot remember a single case in which you have lost a penny, because you have only dealt in bullocks?—Yes.

75. So that what it practically comes to, is that the man who deals in old milk cows gets caught?—And pigs.

76. We are talking of cows, are we not. What I want to ascertain, is whether we need trouble about the bullocks and heifers or only deal with the old milk cows?—I cannot go so far as that.

77. But it practically comes, does it not, to milk cows; and the butcher who deals in milk cows is the

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Dr. Hutchinson—continued.

the man who loses money?—I think that is going too far.

78. We have you as a representative man, engaged in these matter for 30 years, and you have not lost a penny because you deal in what one may call the right class of animal; so that the whole thing is boiled down, is it not, to the man who deals in milk cows. Then do you say that if a man gives 8*l.* for a milk cow, and takes it and slaughters it, and it is found to be tuberculous, he ought to be compensated?—No.

79. I thought you said in that case 8*l.* would be a reasonable price; did you not?—No, what we say is, any animal, never mind what is the price, must vary according to the price of meat; we have in the Bill left it entirely with the Board of Agriculture to determine the sum, both minimum and maximum. We do not ask any compensation at high prices for a pedigree animal, for instance.

80. When a butcher buys a milk cow for beef, and gives 8*l.* for it, it is only fair that he should take a certain amount of risk; so that our inquiry is boiled down to cows, is it not?—No, although, as I say, I have been fortunate.

Mr. Spear.

81. Do I understand you to agree that it would be unreasonable to claim compensation unless it could be proved that the living animal showed no signs of disease?—That is so.

82. May I ask if you suggest that the compensation should be partial or for the full value of the carcase?—I will put it at the full value, but we are not particular as to a trifle. We presume that the hide, and so forth, would not be seized.

Dr. Farquharson.

83. You spoke about an inspector in your part of the world who was apparently learning his work at your expense, did you not?—Yes.

84. In a debate in the House of Commons it was stated that these inspectors were men of all classes—shoemakers and decayed tradespeople; is that so?—Yes, men of all kinds, who are appointed without any real regard as to their knowledge of meat or the diseases of animals.

85. Then you are practically placed at the mercy of these people who have had no special training, are you not?—Yes.

86. And that you think a grievance, do you?—A great grievance.

87. What appeal is there from an inspector so appointed?—We have an appeal to Quarter Sessions if a magistrate will state a case.

88. Have not you an appeal to the medical officer of health from the inspector?—He at once appeals to the medical officer.

89. The inspector does?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

90. Does the inspector appeal to the medical officer?—Yes.

Dr. Farquharson.

91. That is to say he may if he likes; but he does not necessarily. Do you mean to say that he acts in consultation with the medical officer?—If he finds anything which is wrong, he can take it away, have it examined by the medical officer; then the case goes before a magistrate

0.16

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

and the carcase is condemned, the magistrate giving the order.

92. The inspector may of his own free will condemn the animal, without the medical officer, may he not?—He can take it away.

93. The uneducated man is not compelled by law, I understand, to take the opinion of the medical officer of health?—Not until after he has taken it away.

94. Then he has an appeal to the medical officer, has he?—Yes.

95. Then you are not at his mercy, are you?—Not entirely.

96. You spoke of a case in which a carcase, though partially condemned, was sold for food afterwards. What amount of difference was there in the value of that animal in that state and what the value would have been originally; how much was the loss?—The carcase was not infected at all; it was some of the internal organs.

97. But you do not get the same price as beef for an animal with a tuberculous liver as you would if it was sound, do you?—Yes; if you did not see the organs you could not tell the difference.

98. It surely cannot be the same class of meat?—Yes, precisely. Last Christmas two of the animals which were shown in competition, one of which was recommended for a prize, were very badly affected with tuberculosis.

99. Is there any definite standard fixed for the rejection of an animal, or is it only at the will and pleasure of the medical officer?—Yes. That is what we complain of.

100. There is no standard, is there?—There is a standard recommended, but it is not law.

101. That is to say, one man might condemn a beast and another might let it go scot free?—Yes.

102. And that you complain of?—Yes.

103. I understand that you do not go quite so far as Dr. Hutchinson with regard to the absence of tuberculosis in the male sex?—Oh, no; bulls are affected as well as cows.

104. But is it the case that 90 per cent. of all milk cows are affected with tuberculosis?—I could not say that. You might select certain herds, especially pedigree herds, which I think would be more affected than ordinary herds.

105. Is the reason why a cow is more subject than an ox to tuberculosis that it is a milk giving animal with an organ which is more likely to be affected?—No, I think it is the unnatural conditions of life and feeding which very largely produces it. If the cow was allowed out in the open air and fed on natural food all its life, instead of being kept in a house or confined premises and eating unnatural food, very likely it would not be much more affected than oxen.

Mr. Barran.

106. Do you want compensation for partial destruction, or only in cases of complete destruction?—When you say partial, partial may mean three parts; because I have known instances, especially in London, where the veterinary inspector who knows his business, often passes three quarters of an animal while seizing the other portion.

107. Then

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Barran—continued.

107. Then you want compensation weight for weight for what is destroyed, do you?—If you please.

108. Then if a uniform practice were established throughout the country, on the lines of the recommendation of the Royal Commission, that only such parts should be destroyed as are affected by tuberculosis, do you think there would be fewer beasts then condemned in which the disease could not be detected beforehand?—Yes.

109. Is your greatest difficulty at the present time on a point which is absolutely outside this Bill, namely the power of the Magistrates to convict for having this meat on the premises. That is not touched by this Bill is it?—But surely it is touched by this Bill.

110. I think this Bill does not touch the question of prosecution. Do you consider that the stigma that is put on the trade by the liability to prosecution is a more serious matter than the pecuniary loss of the value of the carcase?—Of course that depends on the individual. There are plenty of men with good trades who would not be prosecuted for a thousand pounds. I was speaking on Saturday to some people from Glasgow and Edinburgh who told me of a number of cases in which they believed meat had been wrongfully condemned; but they said they could not contest it or raise the question.

111. If meat is condemned partially, is it not frequently the case that portions of the organs which are condemned are used as meat?—Of course all the organs are used in some way or other. If they are sound, the liver, lights and all the things are sold for some food of some kind or other.

112. Would there be a great many cases where other than the lungs and the udder are affected, or is it mostly in those two parts the disease is general?—In the case of cows it would affect very largely the lights and the liver, and then the glands, in the neck glands and breast glands and so forth you would find it, and also in the udder.

113. Practically a considerable weight that would be ordinarily consumed for human food would be condemned?—On the recommendation of the Commission a cow affected as I have described would be entirely condemned.

114. If there is disease in those organs they do not condemn the muscles, I suppose. In a great many cases under the recommendations of the Royal Commission there would be a considerable waste of human food which would be condemned in the carcasses, I suppose?—Yes.

Mr. Field.

115. Have you been for a long time a member of the Federation?—Yes.

116. Is it your experience that during your attendance at the various meetings in England and Scotland, the main complaint of the trade is as to the confiscation without compensation of tuberculosis carcasses?—I do not remember being at a meeting without that having been a subject of discussion.

117. It is your experience that there have been complaints during the last 12 years from all quarters of the kingdom?—Yes.

118. And is that the reason why you come

Mr. Field—continued.

here to give evidence. Are you aware that an agitation has been going on in all the principal cities of the United Kingdom where confiscation is practised against this system?—Yes.

119. Is what the members of the trade complain principally of, that they are subject to a criminal prosecution for what is really an accident?—That is the chief complaint, because it cannot be valued—the loss in regard to a prosecution cannot be estimated. In regard to the carcase we do know the amount of that; but you cannot estimate the loss from a prosecution.

120. Do you hold that under these peculiar circumstances, the men in the trade are subject to a penalisation that does not exist in any other business in the United Kingdom?—Yes, I do not know of any other trade which is so penalised.

121. Are you strongly of opinion that this Committee so far as it can, should take such steps to put matters in this trade on the same footing as in any other business?—I think we have a right to ask that.

122. With regard to the inspectors, it is your opinion that the majority of these men are properly qualified for the positions they occupy?—It is well known, Sir, that it is due to your action in the House that a different state of affairs has been brought about to-day; that no one can be appointed a meat inspector who has not passed an examination and holds a certificate from the Sanitary Institute; but unfortunately the men who were appointed previously are allowed to retain their posts without any examination. As a fact, as one of the Examiners, I have had before me lately several cases of men who hold appointments as Sanitary Inspectors, and I believe in one instance a Chief Sanitary Inspector failed to pass our examination. I had a case on Saturday at Glasgow, and the only man who failed to pass the examination was at that time, and is now, a Sanitary Inspector.

123. Has it ever come within your knowledge that one of these Inspectors did not know the difference between an ox and a heifer?—He did not know the difference between a wether and a ewe.

124. With regard to the medical officer of health, when the meat inspectors appeal to the medical officer of health, is it, as a rule, the practice of the medical officer of health to coincide with the meat inspector's views?—We do not want to be too hard, but my experience is that the medical officer does not know much more than the meat inspector.

125. Is it your opinion that a veterinary surgeon is more competent to deal with these matters?—Yes, I think every meat inspector should be a qualified veterinary surgeon.

126. You mentioned a case at King's Lynn. As I understood, the man who slaughtered the beast was not the owner and he did not offer the carcase for sale; the beast was actually the property of the railway company, and, notwithstanding that, this man was fined?—To be accurate, the man who slaughtered the beast was the butcher's man. The proprietor, who was summoned, had neither seen the bullock nor seen the carcase until he was taken into the slaughter-house by the inspector.

127. Nor

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

127. Nor had he offered it for sale?—Nor had he offered it for sale; and the Railway Company came and gave evidence that it was theirs and all that had been done had been done under their orders. But the butcher was fined, and such is the law, as you know.

128. Was there a case almost similar at Brighouse?—Yes.

129. I ask the question because the Committee might think the King's Lynn case was an exceptional case. With regard to what Dr. Hutchinson asked you in respect to only cows being affected, is it not the fact that two of the prize beasts that were exhibited in the late Smithfield Show were affected?—Yes; one bullock and one pig.

130. They had passed the inspectors?—They had passed the Veterinary Surgeon the day before.

131. Will you tell the Committee something about the confiscation of pigs in the London market at the present time?—The pork trade, as far as the farmers of England are concerned, I should think is dying out as fast as it possibly can. A Royal Commission recommended that in the case of a pig, however slightly infected, the whole carcase should be destroyed. It is a common occurrence in our meat market for as many as thirty at a time, and I think I am right in saying, 30 out of 40 pigs to be seized. I have a case in mind at the time of the Tuberculosis Conference, when 30 out of 40 of one parcel of pigs were seized and condemned. They were young pigs, beautiful pork, but such was the recommendation, and the whole of them had to be destroyed.

Sir Mark Stewart.

132. They were not very bad, I suppose?—No disease could be discovered at all till you had cut through the glands of the neck. A large number of the pigs which are condemned to-day have the glands of the neck affected and no other glands; the disease cannot be discovered in any other part of the body; but notwithstanding that fact the consequences have become so serious that many of the pork butchers in London will not take their pigs away from the market until their heads have been cut off and they have been examined by the inspectors.

Mr. Field.

133. Are you of opinion that the practice which has now been adopted by the inspectors with regard to pigs will seriously affect the industry?—Unless they can get rid of them at other centres where the inspection is not quite so severe. I had a case which came under my notice on Saturday, where a gentleman at Cheltenham having a lot of pigs for sale, sent to a firm in Birmingham to say that he had a lot of pigs to sell of the best quality. They wrote back saying that they would give him so much per stone. Nine were sent on; five were actually condemned, and four of them were partially condemned. They sent him a cheque in return for the amount of pork that had been used. They were summoned with regard to the rest of the nine pigs which had not been used, and the only case in which we have been successful in contesting in that way was this one, when the

Mr. Field—continued.

County Court judge gave a decision in favour of the butcher with the condition of a case to be stated for the High Court.

134. Is it your opinion that under these conditions London buyers will refrain from buying pigs?—As I have said, unless they are inspected and passed by the market inspector before they are taken away. But the result is that it leads to the buying of Dutch pigs, because they are rigidly inspected before being sent over; in fact, that gland of the neck which is most subject to tuberculosis is very generally removed.

Sir Mark Stewart.

135. Do not the Scotch pigs very often come up without their heads?—Some do, but it is a very small quantity that comes up without heads.

136. But that would be the safest place though, would it not?—Yes, but you might just cut through the gland, and so leave a portion of the affected part still visible.

Mr. Field.

137. Is it your opinion that our system of inspection and confiscation is much more serious in England than it is in foreign countries?—I do not think confiscation goes on in foreign countries at all as it does here. According to the evidence on the last Royal Commission, something like 92 per cent. of animals that were said to be infected were passed, and something like 5 or 6 per cent. which were badly affected were sterilised, or whatever you like to call it, and sold by the Government at a less price per pound, and only 2 per cent. were actually destroyed out of the affected animals.

138. Have you any personal knowledge of the practice on the Continent?—No.

139. Is it within your knowledge that certain farmers when they found their cattle to be suffering from tuberculosis have been recommended to feed them up and unload them on the butchers?—I should think that was general knowledge. A man said the other day to me, "I had a beast that was not well, and I sent for a vet., and he said, 'I think it is a case of tuberculosis; I should have it killed.'" Then he had others outside which were affected, and he said, "What am I to do?" and the vet. said, he thought he would be quite justified in feeding them and selling them to the butcher. I think if anybody should be condemned it is the farmer who can know, and who sometimes does know, that animals are suffering from tuberculosis.

140. Is it your opinion that it is on account of the peculiar feeding, or high feeding of pedigree stock, that the King's prize cattle was found to be so bad in this respect?—I think something may be traceable to former generations and inheritance; I think that is possible, but I think very largely it is brought about by the unnatural life, the feeding and the conditions under which they are kept.

141. Is it your opinion that this system of confiscation without compensation is throwing the meat trade as far as possible into the hands of importers and others?—Certainly.

142. That is your opinion, is it?—Yes, there is no doubt about that. Men will not take the risks

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

risks if they can get another article which will answer their purpose: and they can get it at Deptford and Birkenhead.

143. That is to say, in your experience as President of the National Federation, wherever it is practicable or possible, men in the meat trade will buy the article which is imported, whether it be pigs or mutton or beef, in preference to buying home-produced meat, cattle particularly, because they escape the risks of confiscation?—That is so.

144. Do you look upon that as a very serious matter for the agriculturists of this country?—Yes, it must affect the agriculturists. Wherever you send customers to another market you take them away from your own.

Captain Jessel.

145. I suppose it is much easier to get the carcases from abroad; a man runs much less risk, does he not?—I was more particularly referring to Deptford and Birkenhead. When you come to deal with an article obtained there, you have a similar article to the home-killed, and men who deal in home-killed sometimes cannot tell the Deptford and Birkenhead article from home-grown, because it is of the same class.

146. Is there any guarantee with regard to chilled meat?—With part. Speaking of America, I believe there is a very rigid course of inspection, but in regard to the carcases which come from the Continent (and I think Mr. Cooper's evidence will deal more particularly with this) the inspection is not quite up to the standard of that in America.

147. Is it not the case that they are very careful abroad. In France every chop is stamped, and is not that the case with the meat that comes here?—No; no stamping would be done because it would injure the sale.

148. You said that the inspectors of meat were not very competent. Is it very difficult, after a man has had some little experience in the market for some time, to detect a case of tuberculosis?—No, it is not particularly difficult; it is a kind of disease which is distinguishable if it is of any standing at all, but there are stages of the disease in which you can scarcely detect it.

149. I was rather struck by what you said when you complained of the inefficiency of the inspectors, because it does not seem to me a very difficult thing to find it out?—Some people learn more quickly. In the case I referred to, although there was bad infection, the inspector did not detect it at all.

150. In the case of glanders there is compensation, is there not?—Yes, and in several other diseases with regard to animals, such as swine fever.

151. Is this the only case in which no compensation is given?—As far as I am aware that is so.

152. You said, did you not, that between London and King's Lynn there is very little inspection?—Yes.

153. Therefore, may I take it, it is in London the most stringent inspection goes on?—I will not say that in London there is more stringent inspection than in other parts; I have instanced Glasgow and Newcastle, and there are several

Captain Jessel.—continued.

other places. Carlisle is very bad, and there are many places, where we think plenty of beasts are confiscated which ought not to be.

154. As I take it, a good deal of meat killed in London is not sold in London?—Nearly all the meat killed in our private slaughter-houses in London is consumed in London. There is a certain proportion killed at Deptford which goes away, but it is a rare occurrence to find any disease in the imported animals from America or Canada.

155. May not I take it that any compensation will have to be paid by the London ratepayers?—Not for imported animals.

156. But taking animals that are condemned in the London markets, is that not so?—If they are English we ask for it, but we do not ask for it if they are foreign. We have not asked for that; places such as Deptford and Birkenhead we do not ask should be included. You cannot penalise the foreign sender by a prosecution. You may confiscate his goods, but I have never yet heard of a prosecution.

157. Would it not be rather hard on the London ratepayer that he should have to pay the whole of the compensation?—We took the view that we could not bring in a Bill on Imperial lines, and that this was the only way in which we could bring the subject before your notice. We were advised we had no power to go beyond. If the Committee do what we think they ought to do, it should be made an Imperial question.

158. You brought in the Bill in this form, did you, because you were advised it was the only way in which you could bring it?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

159. The greater experience you have had in killing animals is with regard to oxen, of course?—Yes.

160. Do you get many heifers through your hands?—Very few.

161. And practically no cows?—No cows.

162. In regard to the different breeds, did you ever hear of any disease in the Dexter cattle or the Galloway cattle?—We have had one case from Ireland, and that, I believe, was a case of a cross with a Dexter, which came to the Smithfield Club for competition.

163. Have you ever known Galloway cattle infected?—I think, if I may suggest a breed more infected than any other, it is the Aberdeen-Angus.

164. In your experience, have you ever known tuberculosis in the brain?—No, I have not.

165. In testing, it is believed to be proved that an animal may possibly have tuberculosis in the brain, but you have not heard of it, have you?—No; I have not heard of a case.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

166. Would you tell the Committee what happens if, when a butcher is dressing a carcase and finds it is affected, he discloses that fact to the sanitary authority?—You are thinking of the London Act are you. If it is in London (and fortunately we got this clause in the London Act) if we have anything on our premises which is unfit for food, we may give notice in writing

to

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COGGAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

to the sanitary authority, and they must remove it as if it were trade refuse; but that does not apply anywhere outside London.

167. Tell us what happens in towns outside London, where a butcher desires to be honest and to prevent unwholesome meat being consumed as food and he discloses the fact to the sanitary authority; who bears the loss?—He does entirely. He would not be safe outside London if he dressed an animal in the usual way.

168. Supposing directly he discovers the disease he gives notice to the sanitary authorities and takes no further steps in the dressing of the animal, what will the sanitary authority outside London do in that case?—They would simply take the whole carcase away and destroy it.

169. Can they compensate the butcher?—No, there is no power to do that.

170. The butcher will bear the entire loss, will he?—Yes.

171. Can the butcher recover from the seller?—In most cases the butcher has paid for the animal beforehand and he cannot go back.

172. If a butcher desires to carry on his trade with the utmost regard for the public, it will be at his own financial loss, will it?—Entirely.

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

173. And the law as it at present stands, rather encourages the butcher to act dishonestly, does it not?—There is a premium upon dishonesty, decidedly.

174. If he can manage to smuggle the meat through at any risk to the public, he loses nothing?—He loses nothing.

175. But if he is honest and discloses the fact of any disease, he bears the loss?—That is so.

176. So that the local authority has not even the power, even if it desired to exercise it, to compensate him?—No.

Mr. Loyd.

177. Is it to meet that temptation, that it is made criminal for him to retain the meat for the purposes of sale for food?—When this Act was passed, there was no suggestion of tuberculosis, and no care or thought was taken as to it.

Dr. Farquharson.

178. If there are so very few animals infected with tuberculosis, the amount of compensation would not be so very heavy on the rates, would it?—We think it would be so small that the public would not feel it.

After a short Adjournment

Mr. WILLIAM COOPER, called; and Examined.

Sir Mark Stewart.

179. Are you a member of the Corporation of the City of London?—Yes.

180. And Chairman of the Meat and Cattle section of the London Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Council of the Smithfield Club?—Yes.

181. Will you address yourself to this matter as a member of the Council of the Smithfield Club, and not as a member of the Corporation at all. Have you given evidence before on this subject?—Not before this Committee. I gave evidence before a Parliamentary Committee on Meat Marking, also on Foodstuffs in time of War, and I also gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis.

182. Have you been engaged for a long time as meat salesman?—I have been engaged for over 30 years in selling Scotch meat in the Central Market at Smithfield.

183. What is your experience of the Scotch trade?—My experience is that the Aberdeen Angus does not suffer from disease more than any other breeds. I have been a breeder of them and my father before me was a breeder of them, so that I know intimately about the Aberdeen Angus.

184. What about the Galloway breed?—I think the Galloway is one of the hardiest breeds we have, and that is probably accounted for by the fact that Galloway cattle are not tied up by the necks in stalls the same as a great many other cattle in Scotland are; they are fed in yards and herds and are therefore more exposed to the elements, and are naturally hardier.

0.16.

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

185. You have not had much to do with cows and heifers, I suppose?—Being engaged in the Central Market at Smithfield, I have great opportunities of seeing all manner and conditions of carcasses.

186. Would you say that females are more subject to disease than males in the earlier years?—No, I should not.

187. They are not more subject?—They are not more subject.

188. Or so subject?—I should not say there was any difference between the one and the other, because this is a disease which comes from infection; and therefore I cannot presume that there should be any difference between the male and the female.

189. You have had experience, have you not, as a tenant farmer?—I was a tenant farmer under Lord Aberdeen for 38 years, and only discontinued my tenancy 2 years ago.

190. Is it your opinion that it is impossible to discover disease in live animals?—Utterly impossible, except in some very few instances when there does occur wasting; then, of course, the suspicion of a farmer would be aroused, and he would set about to see what was the matter with his animals.

191. Is it not the fact with some of the most healthy-looking animals that they are full of tuberculosis?—Undoubtedly. Last year in the Smithfield Club competition one of the animals that was sent for slaughter, after having been inspected by Professor Axe and passed by him as

B

being

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COOPER.

[Continued.]

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

being sound, was found to be full of tuberculosis and was condemned—and a pig as well.

192. Have you ever tested your cattle with tuberculine?—No, I am not a great believer in tuberculine.

193. Is it your experience there are some cases in which it has no effect whatever?—No effect whatever; and there is always the danger that you may communicate the disease to the animal by tuberculine.

194. Recently, since the Local Government Board gave effect to the report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis, have there been very large seizures of fresh beef?—No, not so much beef as pork. The Royal Commission, as the former witness told you, recommended that where there was any evidence of disease, even of the slightest nature, the whole carcase of the pig should be condemned. It is not so with bullocks. A circular having been issued by the Local Government Board to give effect to that recommendation, the English farmers have suffered enormously through the great confiscation of carcasses in consequence only of the least symptoms of the disease in the thyroid gland, which cannot be observed unless the gland is opened in the throat, and whole carcasses of beautifully nourished pigs have been condemned.

195. Then do you agree with the evidence of the last witness on this point?—Yes. I think that is a very great injustice to the home producer. Everyone knows that in the production and curing of bacon, the thyroid gland would be removed; it is taken away, and therefore when it is smoked and so on, although the disease might have been present to the same extent in the foreign pig that is converted into bacon, the English producer has his pig seized if it comes to our markets; therefore, as usual, he is penalised and the foreigner gets through.

196. And the home producer is very heavily handicapped as compared with the foreigner, is he not?—Yes, and it is altogether so right throughout our laws; we let the foreigner escape and penalise the Englishman. There is no prosecution, no matter what a foreigner may do. We merely confiscate his goods; but if there is the least suspicion as regards an Englishman, we not only confiscate his goods, but we also summon him and fine him heavily.

197. Have you had much experience in the consignment of beef in carcase from Denmark?—I have no experience of it being consigned to me, but being engaged in business in the markets, I see that during the cold seasons we have a large quantity of beef carcasses from Denmark, many of which, although they may bear the Government stamp, are frequently seized by our Inspectors in the Central Markets as affected by tuberculosis.

198. Are those oxen?—They may be oxen or they may be cows. I do not think there is that enormous difference between the sexes.

199. Does much pork come from Denmark?—No fresh pork hardly, but we receive enormous quantities of bacon, and in that I think one of the great hardships of the home producers exists. He sends his pigs to market, the inspectors discover the incipient stages of the disease, and they condemn the whole carcase.

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

In the process of the manufacture of bacon, that disease would be entirely removed.

200. Do you quote a case at Hayward's Heath?—Yes.

201. Will you give the Committee particulars of that case?—There was a man named Roff who purchased at an auction sale at Hayward's Heath, a pig, for which he paid £7. At that auction sale there is an inspector appointed by the auctioneers to see that all the animals that are there exposed for sale are clear of disease. Roff had a slaughter house of his own at Croydon, but he preferred to send the pig to the municipal slaughter house at Croydon, where there is an inspector in the pay and employment of the municipal body. It was passed through the slaughter house in the usual way and sent to the Central Markets. It was seized at the Central Markets and Mr. Roff was summoned at the Guildhall. The magistrate there said, however much he might regret it he could not help it, but there was a breach of the law and he must inflict a penalty. I do not know what other precautions any trader could take than those this man took.

202. And he had to pay the penalty, had he?—Yes, and the worst of it is that we in London feel it very much, because it deters supplies coming to London.

203. Do a great many foreign pigs come into London?—Yes, an enormous quantity.

204. Fresh pork?—Yes. Holland will be one of the principal countries to supply us with fresh pork in the immediate future.

205. Is much of that destroyed?—No, very little of it; they are said to have a very excellent system of inspection there. But I have seen a considerable quantity of it destroyed for tuberculosis here.

206. Have you any opinion to express with regard to meat inspectors, as to whether they should be qualified veterinary surgeons?—I do not think it is at all necessary. The Corporation of London have never insisted upon their inspectors being qualified veterinary surgeons, but what they have done, is to insist on the man having been a practical butcher, before he was appointed an inspector. On that, and giving him a probationary period in the markets, we have always obtained the best results.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

207. Did you hear Mr. Coggan's evidence with regard to the question of disclosure of diseased meat by the butcher?—Yes.

208. Do you agree with him?—Yes.

209. Have you any experience outside London?—In provincial towns, do you mean?

210. Yes?—I know a good deal about them. I have no experience myself, but I am well acquainted with the methods of business in a great many places.

211. Is it a fact that outside London, if the butcher discloses the possession of diseased meat he has to pay the financial penalty?—That I could not say of my own knowledge.

212. Under the law as it at present stands, the temptation is to smuggle diseased meat through, is it not?—I think it must be patent to every person that a farmer cannot afford to say that

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COOPER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

that he believes his beast to be diseased. I think this Bill will be the thin end of the wedge for getting rid of this disease altogether. If you compensate people for diseased carcasses or animals suffering from tuberculosis the facts will be disclosed, and then you may take steps to get rid of the disease. It is a disease which in my opinion can be got rid of, and I have had some experience. We certainly have got rid of pluro-pneumonia, which we all thought was a far more difficult disease to get rid of than this disease, because that is a disease which can lurk in the system many years without being discovered. We have got rid of it in this country entirely through compensation, and in my opinion this disease may be got rid of.

213. Do you agree that it is not difficult to trace back a beast to the seller?—I doubt very much the possibility of tracing it back. You see the course of my business in receiving consignments of fresh meat from Scotland is this: the great bulk of that fresh meat is consigned by dealers, and is bought by them at auction sales principally. They might buy, we will say, five or six bullocks at an auction sale one day, and five or six another day, and so on; and then those animals would get mixed up in the slaughter-house. They would be consigned to London, and it would be very difficult, indeed absolutely, to fix the exact animal.

214. You suggest they would be mixed up in the slaughter-house, but this question of compensation arises in the slaughter-house, does it not?—Yes, but you are suggesting the tracing. I was thinking of the tracing beyond the slaughter-house to the owner whom it came from, and whom the local authority would have to pay.

215. The question of destruction and the consequent question of compensation both arise on detection in the slaughter-house. The person who loses the value of the animal is the person who has it in preparation for food in the slaughter-house, and the question I put to you is—the disease being found in the animal when it is being dressed and prepared for food in the slaughter-house, could that animal be traced back to the seller?—You must look at this as well. You are assuming that the condemnation takes place in the slaughter-house. That may not be the case in all cases; condemnation might take place at the central markets, and that was particularly in my mind when I said there might be a difficulty.

216. You suggest then, do you, that the slaughtered carcass would escape condemnation in the slaughter-house?—It might. It is not every particular village in Scotland, England and Ireland that has inspectors who would condemn carcasses.

217. Then do we get to this, that in such a transaction as you have described, where slaughter had taken place in one town and the carcass is sent on to Smithfield, tracing back would be difficult?—More difficult certainly.

218. But that where condemnation takes place in the slaughter-house itself, the difficulty of tracing back would not be so great?—It would

0.16.

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

be certainly very much less. It might be a little difficult then if the man was in a large way of business; because to keep every individual animal separate which he had bought at various sales would be difficult. I do not say it is impossible.

219. I suppose you and your friends, in putting forward this Bill and suggesting that compensation should be paid by the municipal authorities, condemning the article and recommending its destruction, have recognised the fact that they would be acting in the interests of the meat consumers resident in a particular borough?—I am aware of that, but I am not in favour of that particular line of the Bill. I think all compensation should come from Imperial sources, because we are seeking to benefit the whole community. I can readily imagine that it would be very wrong to saddle a small village or a small district, where a man carried on a large business and went into the districts round the place, perhaps into other counties, and gathered together a large quantity of cattle for his purposes and slaughtered them, with the expense. It would be hard on that particular locality that they should have to pay compensation on animals which never belonged to them at all.

220. Would you go a stage further back in your attempts to stamp disease out, and require notification wherever the disease is observable?—Yes, but the difficulty is in its being observable. An agriculturalist has more opportunities of observing the disease than any other people. I have had experience of that. I have had tuberculosis in my own cattle, and I have observed what have appeared to me to be signs of tuberculosis, and I have verified it by having the animal slaughtered and buried. I think if some process of that sort were generally adopted, it would be the means of getting rid of the disease altogether.

221-2. Are there cases where a veterinary surgeon detects it readily?—Where an animal has wasted very much, yes. I have known wasting in the early stages of the disease.

223. Taking the instance Mr. Coggan gave in his evidence, where a gentleman was advised to get rid of certain cattle, is it common that advice is given by a veterinary surgeon to send a beast to market because it will spoil the rest of the herd. In such a case, the facts ascertainable making tuberculosis plain, would you compel the local authority to give compensation?—I should schedule the disease just as you would foot and mouth disease, or any other disease the bovine race suffers from.

224. I could not quite see the force of your suggestion that the compensation for the slaughtered animal would lead to the stamping out of the disease?—It is the compensation that would lead to the stamping out of the disease. If you knew something about agriculture, as I do, you would know that agriculturalists are not able to do many things which, perhaps, if they had more money, they might wish to do.

Sir Mark Stewart.

225. Have you any knowledge of dairying?—Yes, I have some knowledge of it, but not to the extent it is carried on in many places.

B 2

226. Could

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COOPER.

[Continued]

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

226. Could you say what is the average percentage of cattle suffering from disease in a dairying district?—I am not one of those people who believe that the dairy cow need suffer of necessity. I think with proper sanitation and great care, and elimination of anything that appears to be diseased, dairy cow sheds can be kept as clear of tuberculosis as any other place.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

227. In your judgment is it possible for the meat trade to cover all their risks by a system of mutual insurance?—I have never known any attempt of that kind that was successful. I have known some attempts in Aberdeen and other places, but I have known none that were successful. I do not like it, and I do not think it is an advisable plan.

228. Why?—Because I do not think that is the way to encourage the getting rid of the disease.

229. Do you mean that if the butchers themselves provide their own insurance fund there could be no restriction on the action of the local authorities?—There is none now, and there are very great hardships worked by medical men with cranks.

230. Do you suggest that they would be less likely to indulge in their cranks and fads, if they had to pay for it afterwards?—Yes, I do.

Mr. Loyd.

231. What is the earliest stage after the animal comes into the possession of the butcher at which you have ever known any inspection take place?—I believe that many cases have occurred of the inspector walking in while the animal was being slaughtered.

232. The power to inspect is with an Inspector of Nuisances or the Medical Officer of Health, is it not?—It is the Medical Officer of Health, deputing an inspector of meat, who acts under the Medical Officer of Health. No inspector, I take it, can condemn meat of himself. He simply reports the case to the medical officer, who then condemns it, probably knowing nothing about it, except what he is told.

233. The law is a little different in London, is it not, to what it is in the country outside?—I believe the Public Health Act is somewhat different in London.

234. Are you speaking of London only or generally?—I am speaking generally. You see in the London city markets, where all the great bulk of London food is distributed, it is all dead meat. Then the Corporation slaughter-houses at Islington are under the inspection of two inspectors; a junior and a veterinary surgeon as a senior walk in and out of the slaughter-house as they please.

235. Whose servants are they?—The Corporation's servants.

236. Do you know of any case of an inspector examining a live animal?—The whole of the live animals at the Islington Market are examined by the same inspector who inspects the carcasses after they are dead—Mr. King.

237. Is that the Corporation official?—He is a Corporation official.

Mr. Loyd—continued.

238. Besides that, is there any power for the inspector or medical officer to inspect under the Public Health Act?—No. You see the Corporation Market is situated in the Borough of Islington, those officials you speak of belong to the Borough of Islington and they would have no jurisdiction in the Corporation Markets.

239. Speaking generally, over England and Wales, is there power for any inspector of nuisances or medical officer to examine and report to a magistrate as to diseases in animals? Undoubtedly, that is the method of inspection. There is first and foremost an inspector who would report to his medical officer; the medical officer, if he saw fit to make a condemnation, must take the matter before a magistrate.

240. I think you said just now, did you not, that from your own experience you had found great superiority in inspectors who had had some practical experience of butchering?—That has been the experience of the Corporation of London for many many years, and I may say it has my approval.

241. Would you go so far as to say, if that qualification were required before any meat was condemned, that it would very much alleviate the hardships on butchers in this matter?—No, I do not think so. Of course it is a great benefit to have always uniformity of inspection, and the best way of obtaining uniformity of inspection is to have a general standard of qualification for an inspector.

242. What proportion of people concerned in this condemning of meat do you suppose have had any practical experience in butchering?—The whole of the City inspectors have; I cannot say about other local bodies.

243. Would you recommend for the country at large, judging by the experience of the City, that that should be made a matter of attention, rather than requiring general veterinary knowledge?—I think it is desirable to have general veterinary knowledge in a superior officer. You see the Corporation are not limited to one or two men. All their juniors must have been butchers, but the seniors, with one exception, are veterinary surgeons. It is not every borough you see which can afford to pay for these expensive servants, hence, in an ordinary village, you have a man who is appointed as a sanitary officer, not so much with regard to meat as drainage or anything else. They would not be able to pay a proper man, and hence the hardships which occur.

Sir Edward Strachey.

244. Of the animals that come into London, what is the percentage of animals affected?—A very small percentage indeed, in fact, I might say, having been on the Corporation Market Committee which has to deal with the foreign animals at Deptford, I know for one or two years the only carcasses that we condemned for tuberculosis were the carcasses of some pedigree bulls which had been sent out to the Argentine, had not passed the tuberculin test there, and had been sent back to this country.

245. As meat?—As live animals.

246. In the case of an ox being found to have tuberculosis and being slaughtered, on whom does

21 June 1904]

Mr. COOPER.

[Continued.]

Sir Edward Strachey—continued.

does the loss fall?—On the butcher who has bought him.

247. Would you give compensation in the case of foreign animals?—Most certainly not.

248. Do I gather from you that you think tuberculosis is caused, to a certain extent, though not to a large extent, by the condition of the cowsheds?—I think there is no doubt about that. You see it is a disease, if it is on the lungs, which can be breathed out; and therefore if the cowshed is close, the other animals inhale that atmosphere and no doubt contract the disease.

249. Where cattle are confined during the whole winter, do you think that leads to tuberculosis being more rife?—I think so. I think Denmark is the hot-bed of tuberculosis myself, and that principally through the climatic conditions under which the animals are obliged to live.

250. And under the conditions under which they are kept?—Yes, the housing; we all know that open air is considered to be the best thing for consumption or tuberculosis.

Mr. Barran.

251. Supposing compensation were given under this Bill, what amount would you suggest as the minimum amount for beef of three classes—milk cows, heifers and bullocks, and pigs. What would be the minimum price first of all for milk cows?—I would rather not limit myself to any particular figure, because I think that would be better left to an official of the Board of Agriculture. The price of live animals fluctuates and you cannot fix an arbitrary rule.

252. Are you prepared to suggest a price?—I would not give anybody, under any conditions, less than 8*l.* or 9*l.*

253. Supposing they were milk cows. Taking milk cows, would you say 8*l.* to 10*l.* according to the varying price of meat?—Do you mean a maximum of 10*l.*? I think they would be worth more than that at times.

254. The previous witness suggested that a minimum price should be fixed, below which no compensation should be given. That minimum you say is difficult to fix, because the price of meat varies, I understand?—Yes.

255. Therefore the minimum might vary also, say 1*l.*, 2*l.*, or 3*l.*, might it not?—Yes.

256. Then can you suggest any two figures between which the minimum should vary?—I should say I do not think any compensation should be given on an animal which was not worth 8*l.*

257. When meat was cheap. If you wish the Committee to form an opinion as to what the price should be, we must get it from the trade?—I do not myself see any difficulty, because it is, I think, for the Board of Agriculture to fix the price. They are in touch with all the trade prices; they have a monthly return of all the markets and issue it.

Sir Mark Stewart.

258. It is a fact that the price of cows varies, does it not?—The price of the carcasses of cows; if you pay for carcasses you are not paying for the live animals.

Mr. Barran.

259. Then cannot you give any indication of what you think would be a minimum price?—Yes, I say 8*l.*

260. And you think that is not too low, do you?—No it is not too low—I think it is quite high enough.

261. What do you think should be the minimum price for pigs?—I do not see that it is possible to fix the price for pigs, because everything depends on the size of the pigs; some of them are 30 stone and some only 8. I do not think it would be possible to fix a minimum in pork.

262. Except that you might fix it best upon a certain weight?—You can do that, I suppose; but that is a matter which I think might fairly well left to the Board of Agriculture.

Sir Mark Stewart.

263. Does not the public taste vary a good deal—at times they want a pig of such and such a weight, and at other times one a good deal more or less?—Yes, that depends on the weather; it depends on whether the weather is hot.

Dr. Hutchinson.

264. Your business, I take it, is in the sale of live cattle?—No, dead.

265. Have you nothing at all to do with live cattle?—No, only dead meat from Scotland.

266. When you sell it do you know whether it is cow-beef or bullock beef?—I hope so.

267. When it comes to you dead do you get a greater quantity of one or the other; is your trade in the best class of beef?—Yes.

268. Then you do not get a great deal of cow beef?—No. May I say that at one time a good deal more cow beef came from the north than now; that was in the days when we did not have the foreign meat.

269. Your evidence you see is so very different to Mr. Coggan's on this question. Mr. Coggan led us to think that tuberculosis was almost confined to cows. You, I understand, on the other hand, who have no cow beef to deal with, think it is general?—I do not say that.

270. Well, comparatively so. Do you think that cows that are tied up do not lose in vitality and do not have tuberculosis?—I do; and I certainly think that the close confining of any animal, cow or ox, will produce this disease.

271. Therefore, you do find, do you not, more tuberculosis in cows than in bullocks, because bullocks are not tied up?—I think you are correct there, but I should not like to say that cows are the only animals that suffer from tuberculosis. I think the male gender under the same conditions would suffer equally.

272. Cows are not under the same conditions, are they. I perfectly agree if a cow was located in the open air it would be no more liable to tuberculosis than a bullock, but we have practically to deal with things as they are; and we come to the fact, do we not, that cows do have tuberculosis to a greater extent than the males?—Quite so.

Dr. Farquharson.

273. Is it not the fact that there is very little—perhaps no tuberculosis, among Canadian animals?

21 June 1904.]

Mr. COOPER.

[Continued.]

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

animals?—There is very little, but I would not like to say there is none.

274. Is that due, do you think, to the way they are kept in the open air?—I should think so. I am clearly of opinion that it is the coddling of animals and keeping them indoors, that is the cause of a great deal of tuberculosis, and especially in the conveying of infection from one animal to another.

275. I understand you to say you have not much faith in the tuberculine tests, and you think it might be dangerous to introduce tuberculine into animals which might be free. Is that opinion based on a theory, or based on facts?—It is a theory of my own derived from conversation with breeders. You know in the county to which you and I belong, there are some of the best breeders of shorthorns who absolutely refuse to have their animals submitted to the tuberculine test. Those men are men of very great experience indeed; they are men I have known all their lives, and whose opinion weighs very greatly with me.

Mr. Field,

276. Is it your opinion that the inspection of imported meat is not so rigid as it might be?—Do you mean after it arrives in this country?

277. No, before it arrives?—I think some foreign countries are not so particular as to the inspection of the carcasses they are importing; they are particular about what they keep at home.

278. Is it your experience that some of the carcasses which come here and pass as all right have been condemned abroad?—Yes, but may I say that I think you will have the opportunity of having the Corporation Inspectors before you, and all questions of fact will come far better from them.

279. The point I want to elucidate in connection with it is, is it your opinion, judging from these circumstances, that our inspection here is more rigid and effective than it is in foreign countries?—I have reason to believe that in Germany there are really only two classes of people, that is the inspector and the inspected. We do not go in for anything like that here. I think our inspection, as far as the City of London is concerned, is first rate.

Mr. Field—continued.

280. Would you advise this Committee to ask Mr. Territt, the Chief Inspector of the Central Meat Market, to give us evidence?—The Veterinary Inspector at the Metropolitan Cattle Market belonging to the Corporation is a man who will have statistics. Mr. Territt is a very able man who might give you valuable information with regard to the seizures of fresh meat which take place in London.

281. Is it your opinion with regard to the importation of bacon which may be introduced into this country, that the native producer is penalised?—I think the native producers in this country are dreadfully penalised all round as to railway rates, and every rate it is possible to mention.

282. Do you think the present system of confiscation, and inspection without compensation, is detrimental to the native producer in the United Kingdom, and places him at a disadvantage?—I think it is wrong altogether; it is a premium on the concealment of disease, it encourages the disease in every way, and it is the worse system which could possibly be devised—to confiscate without compensation.

283. Would you propose that the compensation should come from an Imperial fund?—Certainly.

284. The same as in the case of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, anthrax and swine fever?—Certainly, it ought to be a scheduled disease.

285. And I think you said, did you not, it would be the best way to further the extermination of tuberculosis?—Undoubtedly it is the only way.

286. Did you ever hear, or are you aware, that during recent times the confiscation in Aberdeen amounted almost to one ox every day?—I know there have been very grave complaints by meat traders there of the very extraordinary way in which carcasses have been confiscated, quite contrary to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. They probably have one of those cranks there whom I mentioned before.

Thursday, 23rd June 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.

Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Mark Stewart.

Mr. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. THOMAS WEBSTER, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

287. Are you a wholesale meat salesman in the Glasgow Meat Market?—Yes.

287*. Are you President of the Glasgow Fleshers' Society?—Yes.

288. Is that society composed of the best fleshers in the city of Glasgow, about 450 in number?—Yes.

289. Have you been in the cattle and fleshing trade all your life?—Yes.

290. At one time were you under-manager of the Glasgow Meat Market Company, Limited?—Yes.

291. And afterwards manager for five years?—Yes.

292. So both on your own account and as an official of the Company you have had very great experience in these matters, have you?—That is so.

293. Was the business of that company one of receiving live stock and killing it, and selling it on commission?—Yes.

294. During your experience there, did you find that people who consigned cattle to you complained bitterly of their loss through the cattle being seized for tuberculosis?—That is so.

295. Have you known of many consignors who have practically lost their all owing to that cause?—That is so.

296. Could you, without mentioning names, tell the Committee an instance of that sort?—I know of a particular case where the consignor was a man who had bought in the open market as a speculator, had had the cattle slaughtered and sent to us; his capital was not very large, perhaps 100*l.*, and very soon he was driven out of the trade altogether.

297. He never had more than 100*l.* capital?—He had at one time, but during my time he had not much more than 100*l.* to 150*l.*, I know others who have failed in business and attributed their failure to the fact of losing considerably through beef being condemned as being affected with tuberculosis.

Chairman—continued.

298. Keeping to the case of the man you named, do you know of your own knowledge that his beef was condemned in several cases?—Yes, I know quite a lot of it was condemned. He had bought the cattle at outside sales both in Glasgow and the district, brought them to Glasgow, had them slaughtered there, they were inspected, and on being inspected some portions were condemned, in some cases heads and tongues, and in other cases forequarters.

299. Were those cows or bullocks?—Both.

300. Do you know of any instance of bullocks being condemned belonging to this man?—Yes.

301. But he was a speculator, I understand?—There are quite a number of them in Glasgow who buy in an outside market and in the country districts, and have the cattle sent to Glasgow and slaughtered and sold in the beef market.

302. Is it your belief that that man bought in good faith?—Yes, and bought very good cattle, mostly.

303. How many cattle had you through your hands per week while engaged with that Company?—Upwards of 200.

304. And 80 to 100 pigs?—Yes, in the season we had more; at Christmas time, for instance.

305. Can you tell the Committee what percentage of those would be condemned for tuberculosis; would 1 per cent. be condemned. Would there be two cattle condemned a week?—Not totally, I daresay, but in parts we should have more than amounted to the weight of two cattle or four cattle condemned. We had often sections of beasts condemned. For instance if the forequarters were affected the forequarters were condemned; if the glands of the hind quarters were affected the hind quarters would be condemned.

306. What would be an average of the carcasses condemned to the meat slaughtered; would it be 1 per cent. per week?—Much more.

307. What

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

307. What would you say would be a fair average?—Of cows and bullocks combined it would be over 2 per cent., I fancy.

308. Would you have an average of four of your cattle condemned each week?—Yes, taking cows and bullocks it would be near about that, or it might be $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., to be correct.

309. Would the average be higher in the case of pigs?—I do not think so; about the same.

310. Would you say that the average of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for cattle, purchased in good faith, and having a good appearance before death, was the amount condemned?—Yes.

311. Since you left that Company have you been a wholesale meat salesman on your own account for eight years?—I have.

312. Selling considerably on commission?—At first I was selling considerably on commission, latterly I have been buying all my own cattle. I am still selling on commission pigs and sheep.

313. Having been in business all your life, I suppose you are a fairly good judge of cattle?—I should be.

314. But you find you get deceived, do you?—Very often in home-bred cattle.

315. Can you tell the Committee the average percentage of cases in which you were deceived?—My own experience has been comparatively small, because I buy very few home cattle. I buy mostly American cattle.

316. Would you be deceived in the case of a tuberculous beast, and have it condemned once in 100 purchases?—Yes.

317. More than once?—Much more.

318. What should you think would be a fair percentage of the number of times they have deceived you?—I have not bought more than perhaps a dozen to a score of cattle occasionally in the open market, and I have had frequently portions of my beef condemned. I have only had three bullocks condemned *in toto* during my experience.

319. In your whole experience?—No; in six years, since I commenced buying on my own account.

320. That is as to bullocks. Can you give the Committee any idea of the proportion as to cows?—I have not been trading much in cows. I have had a few cows condemned, but I have not been trading much in them. I receive cows on commission principally, because they are doubtful to buy, especially under a certain price.

321. Did you say you had taken to buying considerably at foreign wharves?—That is so.

322. Was that on account of loss when you bought home-bred cattle?—Principally on that account.

323. As to the cattle slaughtered at foreign wharves, is the inspection not so strict?—Just as strict, but the disease is not there. I have never had a whole bullock condemned from there, and I am killing from there close on 100 cattle a week.

324. Are they very/nearly all bullocks?—Heifers and cows as well.

325. Are there quite a lot of cows?—Yes.

326. Do you buy many cows there?—I buy cows frequently, and heifers.

Chairman—continued.

327. Do you find as much tuberculosis in them as in the home breeds?—I have never had one condemned there, totally, for tuberculosis.

328. How are cattle inspected before they leave the country of origin?—I am not aware of any inspection.

329. Had you had pigs sent over to you largely from Ireland and the North of Scotland?—Yes.

330. In all appearances have they been perfectly healthy?—Yes.

331. Have they been in some cases partly, and in some totally, condemned afterwards?—That is so.

332. Do I gather that as you were selling on commission, in that case the loss did not fall on you?—That is so.

333. Can you give the Committee, in illustration of that, cases of consignors whom you have lost?—Yes, I have lost several consignors in the North of Scotland; they could not understand the pigs being confiscated when, to all appearance, they were clear of any disease when they arrived in Glasgow. The veterinary surgeon searches the different portions for the glands, and if he finds the slightest trace of tuberculosis in the glands, although not visible to the eye, he condemns the pig *in toto*.

334. Do they come to you dead?—A number do, but the Irish pigs come alive.

Dr. Hutchinson.

335. Do they deal with the whole pig?—In the case of the gland in the head being affected, the head is taken off and the carcase is passed; if any other gland is affected the whole pig is condemned.

Chairman.

336. Have you a trade expression called "mincers"?—Yes.

337. What is the explanation of that expression "mincers"?—They are thin cows that are bought at certain seasons of the year from 3*l.* to 4*l.* per head, and they are mostly put out in poor localities.

338. Do you consider those cows suffer a great deal from tuberculosis?—Yes.

339. And you do not suggest any compensation should be given in a case of that sort, do you?—I do not think so.

340. What is the limit below which you would not compensate?—8*l.* would be a fair limit, I think.

341. Of course there is a great deal of difference in the value of cattle according to the breed and size. Would 8*l.* be a fair limit all round?—For killing purposes a party buying a cow at less value than 8*l.* would be running a certain amount of risk, and the cow might not pass inspection; but above that price the cow might seem to be perfectly healthy, with no appearance of disease whatever.

342. I believe your place of business is close to the chamber where suspected animals are detained, is it not?—That is so.

343. Are suspected animals detained alive?—No; after slaughter.

344. Do you go in occasionally and look round?—Yes, frequently; I have been called in there

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

there by many of the members to see carcasses that have been condemned.

345. Would you be able to give evidence after seeing them slaughtered that they had had a healthy appearance before slaughter?—Yes, I have seen quite a number of them before slaughter, cattle costing from 18*l.* to 25*l.* and they appeared perfectly healthy.

346. The Bill proposes that the Magistrate should satisfy himself that the beast, which he, of course, has never seen before it was slaughtered, had a healthy appearance before slaughter. Do you think there will be no difficulty in a man of experience giving evidence that it must have had a healthy appearance before slaughter, from seeing a carcass?—Yes, anyone seeing a carcass after slaughter could form an opinion whether the beast had been thoroughly sound or not before slaughter.

347. Do you consider that in the case of a carcass being seized and condemned, the full price should be paid?—I think so. If a carcass is bought in good faith and is apparently thoroughly healthy and sound, the full price should be paid.

348. So that if the bargain turns out all right, the butcher would get all the profit, naturally; but if it turns out to be a bad bargain the community would bear all the loss, would it not?—If he was giving full market price for it, his profit would be very small; there is a very keen competition.

343*. But still what profit there was he would get, would he not?—Yes, and in the event of a fall in the market he would sustain a loss.

349. If the transaction turned out to be a loss, you think the community ought to bear the whole of it, do you?—Yes, it is the community which is protected.

350. Inspectors condemn other things, do they not; for instance, fish?—Yes, if it is in an unsound condition.

351. Fish is bought in bales, and the buyer has no opportunity of examining the inside of the bale. Do you know anything of the fish trade?—I do not know anything of the fish trade.

352. If that is so, if fish is sold in boxes or bales, and the buyer has no chance of examining the interior of the box, do you think the community ought to compensate him if it turns out that the interior fish of the box or bale is rotten?—It depends on the condition.

353. He has no great means of judging whether he is making a good bargain or a bad one than you have, has he?—I will not venture an opinion on that point.

354. Then, of course, you have other risks to contend with in your business; for instance, meat may go bad owing to change of weather, I understand?—Yes; and through not giving it proper attention.

355. But cannot it go bad in consequence of great heat coming on, or something of the sort?—Sometimes it does; but that is a slight loss; you never lose a whole carcass.

356. But you could not foresee a change of weather any more than you could discover the presence of tuberculosis, could you?—But you could make provision by putting your meat in

0.16.

Chairman—continued.

the chill; if you had any meat left over from Saturday to Monday you could put it in the store.

Dr. Hutchinson.

357. In the country?—Yes, in the country there are mostly ice-boxes in the shops.

Chairman.

358. I wanted to get from you how you distinguish between those and ordinary trade risks?—It is impossible to detect tuberculosis in cattle; it is a matter of utter impossibility, even by experts.

359. But if I buy a horse at Aldridge's, and it turns out to be dangerous to drive in the streets, and I cannot drive it in the streets, I cannot tell that on looking at the horse at Aldridge's, can I?—But you get a guarantee that the horse is quiet, I understand.

360. No, I am assuming a horse bought without a warranty?—If you buy a horse without a warranty, then of course you give a much less price for it and run the risk.

361. Would a system of warranty be impossible in the case of cattle?—It would not be impossible.

362. I am not advocating it, because it appears to me to merely throw back the loss on the farmer; but I am asking you whether you think it would be impossible to get a warranty with cattle, that they are not suffering from disease?—You could not get a warranty from dealers. Cattle coming to the Glasgow market pass through several hands before reaching the market; therefore you could not trace them back to the breeder. A lot of it is Irish store cattle shipped to Scotland and fed there for one season, and it passes through several hands before reaching Glasgow.

Sir Mark Stewart.

363. Would it not be absolutely impracticable to obtain from a farmer a warranty that cattle was sound?—I have known of some cases where buyers have bought cows from farmers on certain conditions and at certain prices, where the farmer has given a warranty; but in very few cases would you get a farmer to give a warranty.

364. But usually that is done where the animal is sold at a very high price, is it not?—A very few farmers send their cattle to Glasgow direct.

365. Did you ever know of any farmer who gave a warranty?—Yes, I have heard of them.

366. Did you ever know of one personally?—No; I could not tell you the exact person.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

367. Can you account for the wide difference you have noticed between the imported and the home-bred cattle with regard to the disease?—I believe there is not so much sub-breeding in foreign cattle as there is in home cattle; perhaps the feeding may be another objection.

368. Did you hear the evidence given by Mr. Coggan and Mr. Cooper at our last sitting?—No.

369. Have you read it?—I read a short account in the *Glasgow Herald*.

C

370. But

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

370. But you have not read it fully?—No.

371. Have you considered at all the possibility of the trade covering itself by a system of mutual insurance?—I think it would be almost impossible to get dealers to insure their cattle partially or totally.

372. Can the butchers insure against the risk?—We have had a meeting about that in Glasgow, but we did not find the butchers agree at all; they would not insure their cattle.

373. Is it done at Paisley, do you know?—I believe there is a system at Paisley between the auctioneer and the buyer, that the auctioneer holds a certain amount from either side; but I do not think that works very well.

Chairman.

374. A shilling a beast he holds, I understand?—Something of the kind, I believe; I never buy at Paisley.

375. It was given in evidence before Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission, that he took a shilling a beast from the buyer and seller, and paid them three-quarters if the carcass was condemned. Have you heard of that?—I have heard of such a system; in fact we have a system in Glasgow at the present time practised by one auctioneer, who charges half-a-crown for a cow and sixpence for a bullock to both sides; but I understand that he is giving that up as being very unprofitable to him. That is the Strathmore Auction Company.

376. Do you happen to know how long that auctioneer has been carrying on that system?—Not 12 months—less than 12 months, I think.

377. Is he giving it up because he finds he is losing money?—He told me himself it was not paying him; he was running an insurance policy himself.

378. Is he in a big way of business?—They have a fair trade; it is a limited company.

379. What number of beasts a week would they sell on an average?—In Glasgow they sell from 100 to 300 cattle.

380. And the figure is 6d. per bullock and 2s. 6d. per cow, is it?—Yes.

381. Is the Company going to give up the practice with regard to both?—I was told a week ago that it was not paying, and I understood that they were going to give it up altogether.

382. Did they pay the full value?—Yes, the full value.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

383. Do I understand that you and your friends declare that the practice with regard to condemnation differs in different districts?—Yes, very much.

384. Therefore any mutual insurance scheme would necessarily have to be limited to a very narrow area, would it not?—According to the district.

385. Where the system of condemnation was the same?—That is so.

386. Because the risk would be different in different areas, and hence the premium that would have to be paid to cover the risk would be different?—That is so.

387. Do you agree with Mr. Coggan and Mr. Cooper that if the local municipal authority

*Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.*were to be called upon to pay compensation they would exercise greater care?—Yes, I am quite of that opinion. Our standard of inspection in Glasgow is very high, in fact, there is a friend of mine who has lost in 18 months 363*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* for condemned beef, and he buys good animals, I am sure.388. Are there any other cases of that sort within your knowledge?—Yes, I know another firm which loses between 200*l.* and 300*l.* a year, and that firm kills the best beef of finest quality.

389. Then those who do not buy such high-class animals suffer far greater risk, do they, and sustain greater loss?—Yes, those who buy cows of a lower standard. Of course, they may not have so much capital and they lose more animals, but not so much worth in money.

390. May I put it that the witnesses who are being put forward by the Trade Federation are probably the best of the traders buying the highest class of animals?—That is so.

391. So that you and your colleagues who have appeared in the witness chair have not incurred so great a risk as many of the traders whom we are not likely to see?—That is so. There are a lot of men who trade in the "mincers" line who have not much capital, and have lost far more cattle; but not so much in money's worth.

392. But their trade is a perfectly honest trade, I understand?—Yes, the trade is a perfectly honest trade. It is a little bit of a gamble, of course, when the cattle is of inferior quality.

393. And you on their behalf have put forward no claim. If there is an obvious risk in the price they pay, they know they are running the risk, do they?—That is so.

394. But between those who run an obvious risk, and yourselves who purchase the highest class of cattle, will there be a large number of traders doing a legitimate trade and yet incurring a substantial risk?—That is correct.

395. And are such instances within your knowledge?—Certainly, many of them.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

396. Do you consider that the system of inspection in Glasgow has been carried out reasonably or unreasonably. You say, I understand, that it has been very strict, do you not?—It has been very strict during the last few years. The standard is very high. If an animal is affected slightly in the forequarter, we think, as a trade, a portion only of it might be condemned; but the Inspector takes the whole forequarter. If the hind quarter gland is affected, we think that a mid-cut might be taken out round about the affected part; but he takes the whole hind quarter. Formerly it was not so, in the case of good cattle.

397. Then do you think that meat is condemned which might safely be sold for food?—Quite safely; I would eat it myself; and I think it a great shame to see some of the finest nourished cattle you would wish to see condemned *in toto* when only the glands are slightly affected.

398. Supposing the inspection were regulated in some way, would that meet your wishes as well as this Bill; that is to say, if no meat was destroyed which was considered as fit for human food

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

food?—If no meat was condemned except what I thought personally was unfit for human food, I would not ask for compensation.

399. Would that be another way of dealing with the difficulty?—Yes.

400. Did you give the total loss you had sustained in the year?—Not my own total loss. I have given a neighbour's total loss, who deals mostly in the home trade and home fed cattle.

401. Can you give us your own loss?—No, I could not give it exactly; it is not very heavy, my own personal loss, because I have not been buying home-bred bullocks.

402. Has there been any loss to you?—I have not lost altogether perhaps more than 40*l.* in the whole time I have been in trade myself—I mean from tuberculosis.

403. The Committee were told that the cause of tuberculosis was that the cattle were fed and kept under unnatural conditions. Do you agree with that view?—Where cows are kept in close byres, I believe that the disease is infectious, because the ventilation is not good, and especially amongst Ayrshire cattle. Ayrshire cows are very much affected.

404. In that case it would be an object in any legislation, would it not, to try and get rid of a system which tended to promote unhealthiness?—That would be looked to if we have Imperial inspection and compensation, and I believe it would lessen very much the disease, ultimately.

405. At the present time I suppose, the risk being on the butcher, the tendency is for him to prefer to buy cattle which are likely to be healthy?—Certainly; but notwithstanding that, he cannot tell.

406. And that tendency would be removed if he received compensation, would it not?—Oh, no; he would be always inclined to buy healthy cattle.

407. But if he has to run the risk of loss if he buys animals which are affected with tuberculosis, surely he is more careful than he would be if he were compensated, for those animals; because he stands to lose more, does he not?—I do not think it would increase the carelessness of the butcher, supposing he was compensated.

408. It would not make him more careful, would it?—He would not be more careful than he is now. If a person wants good cattle he has to face keen competition, and there is a high price paid for them.

409. Surely the man who lost the 363*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* in 18 months would be likely to be more careful than he would be if he could claim on the rates?—I do not think so, because he has to compete in the market and must buy good cattle.

410. But if he recovered his loss from the rates, he obviously would have had more money to spend on cattle, would he not?—That is so.

411. Do you belong to the Traders' Defence Association in Glasgow?—I do.

412. Have they ever considered this question at all?—Yes. Most of them belong to the Society I represent.

413. Have they made any practical attempt to deal with this matter?—Not further than recommending us to make this appeal on behalf of the trade.

0.16.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

414. For compensation out of the rates?—Certainly.

Dr. Hutchinson.

415. You say you have read part of Mr. Coggan's evidence which he gave on Tuesday last?—No; I read a small paragraph in a newspaper.

416. He said that bullocks were affected, but not cows; while you say that in your business, which is also a large one, your loss only comes to 7*l.* a year, I understand, on the average of the last six years?—That is so.

417. You do not buy cows, do you?—No. I said that that was all my loss on the cattle bought at York Hill.

418. Do you buy cows among the home-bred cattle?—Sometimes; and I have lost whole bullocks, 22*l.* worth, the finest bullocks that could be looked at.

419. How often?—I had one bullock condemned *in toto* and several in parts.

420. That is as to home-fed cattle, is it?—Yes.

421. The Chairman gave an illustration of a man buying a cheap horse and having to take the risk of whether it turned out well or not. Do you think that a man who gives 8*l.* for a cow to sell as beef ought to be compensated any more than a man who buys a cheap horse-ought?—I think he should.

422. 8*l.* is a very small price, is it not, for a cow?—Yes.

423. Do not you think that limit is too low?—At certain seasons of the year you can buy some very well nourished good cows for 8*l.*, 9*l.*, or 10*l.*

Sir Mark Stewart.

424. These are Ayrshire cows, which are very small, are they not?—Yes.

Dr. Hutchinson.

425. You refer to the smaller breed of cow I suppose?—Yes.

426. Do not you think that would be what might be described as a gamble in cows?—There are some butchers in country districts and low localities killing those cows. They are perfectly healthy to look at, although they are small; and I think if the butcher pays 9*l.* or 10*l.* he should be protected, but under 8*l.* they should not be protected. Over 8*l.* I think they should have protection.

427. And you do not look upon it as gambling, then?—No.

428. Do you look on it as a legitimate trade?—As a legitimate trade in that class of animals.

Mr. Loyd.

429. Are your cattle inspected under the Borough Police Act, or under the bye-laws of the Corporation?—Under the bye-laws of the Corporation, I understand. The Health Committee is the authority.

430. Are all the condemnations condemnations of carcasses, or do you know of an Inspector condemning a beast as it stood alive?—No.

431. It is entirely a question of condemning a carcass, is it?—Yes, after it is slaughtered and dressed.

c 2

432. As

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Loyd—continued.

432. As it is a mere question of condemning carcasses, will you tell me where you say the claim for compensation comes in?—If the beast is seemingly to the eye in thoroughly good health, and after being slaughtered it is found to be affected with tuberculosis either in small glands or on the surface, that beast should be compensated for; because the buyer has bought it in good faith and has given the full market price for it.

433. Then the grievance does not turn upon the extreme caution with which parts are rejected, which you think would be wholesome?—I have said that, in my opinion, if the affected parts in good animals were removed when dead, according to my mind I would not ask for compensation.

434. It would not amount to a sufficient grievance to call for compensation?—No; of course, that is not the opinion of the Health Committee.

Dr. Farquharson.

435. Are you satisfied with the way the inspection of animals is carried out at Glasgow?—No, I am not.

436. Are you satisfied with the class of men who are carrying on the inspection?—The inspector, I believe, works up to his judgment and to the law laid down for him.

437. But is there any law laid down?—There is a recommendation of the Royal Commission.

438. But that is not a law. Is there any different standard to guide inspectors in doing their work; that is to say, a standard of how much disease an animal must have before it is condemned?—We cannot tell that. The inspector simply says the animal is affected with tuberculosis, he does not say how much; but he orders the condemnation of it.

439. These inspectors are not always men of high scientific attainments, are they?—An inspector is a veterinary surgeon, and is supposed to have good knowledge.

440. But that is not the case elsewhere, is it?—It is the case in Glasgow; he has a staff under him of 12 or 15 officers, and if they see any part affected they detain the carcass and bring him to see it, and he condemns it or otherwise. There is no appeal beyond him.

441. What appeal could you have beyond him?—Supposing we had an Imperial inspector appointed by Government, that we could appeal to in the event of not being satisfied, that would be an assistance to us. We believe as a trade that the standard of inspection laid down by our inspector is too high.

442. I understand that you have had a very small loss while others have had a large loss. Do you think that the general amount of loss is sufficient to render it necessary to have any legislation at all. Do not you think it would put a very heavy burden on the rates?—The loss is very heavy on those who buy home cattle solely. I do not buy home cattle solely.

443. But is the loss heavier on those who buy a high standard of animal?—Yes; I have quoted two cases, and those two cases are cases in which the men deal in first class animals; one has lost 363*l.* odd in 18 months, and the other is losing, roughly, between 200*l.* and 300*l.* a year.

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

444. Do I understand you to say that you would not object to eating the flesh of a tuberculous animal?—If the beef was thoroughly healthy to all appearances except the affected part, yes. If the portions surrounding the affected part were cut away I would eat any portion of a good bullock or heifer.

445. As to compensation, you say you would pay the full price of the whole animal; but you would not pay a fancy price, would you?—Certainly not. I do not think over 30*l.* should be paid for compensation.

446. I do not quite follow your objection to insurance, which seems to me to be reasonable. What is your objection to it?—It has never been generally tested in the trade, but I do not think it would be practicable to work it out.

447. If you paid a shilling a head, it would be a very small tax, would it not?—There is the one case in Paisley where there is quite a small auction sale, and where there are very few cattle exposed.

448. Supposing there were a fund created out of the rates, what conditions would be necessary to protect that fund against unreasonable or fraudulent claims?—The magistrates and the inspectors in the locality could judge whether the claim was overreaching or not.

449. In the case of a knock-out between a farmer and a butcher, the farmer sending an inferior class of animal to the butcher, and the butcher having it killed and then asking for compensation, what would you do?—Then the evidence would be laid before the magistrates, which would be satisfactory, surely.

Mr. Spear.

450. You told us your experience with reference to bullocks and cows, but said nothing about sheep. Do you deal in sheep much?—Yes. I do not deal myself; I have a large number of sheep consigned to me from farmers, principally in the North of Scotland.

451. Have you ever had a sheep condemned for tuberculosis?—No, and I have handled close on a thousand in a week myself, in a certain season.

452. British or foreign?—British.

453. It is a technical question, but do you think that sheep are not liable to tuberculosis?—They might be, but I have never had any myself that were affected.

454. It was suggested to you that, possibly, if a local authority had to pay compensation it would make the butcher more careless in purchasing beasts; but if the risk was covered by insurance, the same principle would hold good, would it not?—I think the butcher who buys first class goods competes in the open market and pays the very highest value at the present time, would also do the same thing then. He does not leave any surplus in anticipation of beasts being condemned now.

455. It is a fact, is it not, that a live animal may present no appearance of tuberculosis?—Not the slightest.

456. Is it not a fact that some of the best beasts sold have been proved to have tuberculosis, while some of the thinner animals may not have tuberculosis at all?—Yes, there are a number

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Spear—continued.

number of old emaciated cows which have no fatty substance about them at all, which are passed, and if the glands are slightly affected the portions are cut off.

457. So that the inspection of the live animal can afford you an indication as to the presence or otherwise of tuberculosis?—Not at all.

Mr. Kilbride.

458. How is it that you arrive at the 8*l*. limit?—I think under that price there are quite a number of cows which are apparently unhealthy in appearance. They are not fully developed as fat cattle for a butcher, and they are bought by small butchers and speculative punters for mincing purposes.

459. But I want to know how you arrive at the 8*l*. limit. An 8*l*. limit does not mean quality of beef, does it; because at an 8*l*. limit you may have a worn-out Shorthorn cow, and at the same limit you may have a thoroughly sound Ayrshire cow. Would it not be better, instead of having an 8*l*. limit, to have the matter regulated by a price per cwt. of the carcase?—You might in that case have a Shorthorn thin cow not at all healthy-looking, or you might have a 5-cwt. Ayrshire cow thoroughly beautiful and thoroughly sound and healthy.

460. Then do not you think it would be better, instead of making it an 8*l*. limit, to have as the test the price of the value of the butchers' meat per cwt.?—I believe it would.

461. What price would you fix. Supposing you substitute per cwt. instead of the 8*l*. limit, would you regulate the quality of the meat; because I think that is the point—it is the quality of the meat and not price, is it not?—You could regulate the price then by the market price given by the butcher for dead meat carcasses.

462. What price then would you put it at?—According to the market price. Sometimes those thin cows are very dear because they are scarce, and at other times they fall in price. I should fix the price according to the market price at the time of slaughter.

463. But if first-class meat is worth 60*s*. say, what price per cwt. would you take instead of the 8*l*.?—You could put in perhaps in that case for cows of the class specified 40*s*. per cwt.

464. Then do you think as regards any cow that is not high-class meat but is worth 3*l*. per cwt. it should be compensated for, but any cow the carcase of which is worth less than 40*s*. there ought to be no compensation for?—That is so.

465. Have you found that show cattle bought fat at cattle shows and killed afterwards show a higher percentage of tuberculosis than others?—I believe they do.

466. Why?—Because of the over-feeding perhaps.

467. You said, did you not, that a good deal of tuberculosis is due to the way dairy cows are kept as dairy cows?—That is so, and the feeding, the forcing.

468. Do you think that if cows are fed on brewers' grains and fed on them hot, it has a bad effect on the cows?—I certainly do.

Mr. Field.

469. You told the Committee, I understand, that you principally bought States cattle?—Yes.

470. What was the reason you gave up buying native cattle?—The danger of their being condemned, principally.

471. Then is it your evidence that it is owing to the loss by confiscation of native cattle that you have been driven to buy imported cattle?—To a large extent.

472. Do you think that that affects the trade generally all over the Kingdom, and that where men can buy imported cattle they buy them in preference to native cattle?—I can only speak for Glasgow; it affects the trade in Glasgow.

473. Does it have any effect on the price of meat, do you think?—No, there is not very much difference.

474. If the present system of confiscation without compensation is continued, is it your opinion that the native producers will suffer?—Certainly; I am satisfied of that.

475. Are you satisfied that under the present system we are favouring the foreigner and handicapping the native producer?—Yes, that is so.

476. And some amendment of the law is needed you think, do you?—That is so.

477. With regard to the system of inspection, you said that in Glasgow with respect to pigs, that if a gland in the pig's head is only infected the head is taken off?—Yes, and the rest of the carcase is sold. If any other gland is affected the whole carcase is condemned.

478. Are you aware there is a different system in London?—Yes; they are not so strict.

479. Do you believe there are very different standards of inspection at different places, which puts the trade under a disadvantage?—That is so.

480. I understand you would not allow any compensation for what you call "mincers"?—No.

481. Do you agree with the officers of the Federation in saying they would have a standard below which they would not ask for compensation, and above which they would not ask for more—that is to say, 8*l*. or 10*l*., and 30*l*.?—That is my opinion.

482. You do not want compensation for bad meat, do you?—Certainly not.

483. On the question of warranty, do you think a system of warranty could be carried out?—I do not think so.

484. Is it your opinion that if this Committee does not recommend to the House compensation the Trade will be obliged to adopt a system of warranty in self-defence?—I believe they will be forced to that.

485. Is it your opinion that that would possibly lead to confusion and friction?—Yes, between dealers and farmers and butchers.

486. Are you of opinion that a general insurance scheme could be carried out?—I do not think so.

487. Why not?—Because of the fact of the animal passing through so many hands.

488. Do you believe that the penalty of insurance would be too high on the flesher?—No, I do not say that; it might or might not be so.

489. But

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

489. But it is not a system which, in your opinion, could be easily adopted, is it?—No, we have had meetings to discuss the matter in the trade, but we have not been able to come to a conclusion.

490. Are you of opinion that what is confiscated for the public good should be paid for by the public?—Certainly.

491. Are you of opinion that the amount of compensation paid should come from Imperial sources?—Yes, that is my opinion, because in Glasgow we slaughter carcasses which are sent on to different districts. We have also a very large dead-beef market which is patronised by the county butchers; if the taxation was local in that case Glasgow would be liable to a heavy taxation for the beasts confiscated, whereas if it was an Imperial compensation the consumers would pay, which in my opinion would be quite right, for their own protection.

492. You gave, I understand, some particulars as to a man who lost 363*l.* in 18 months?—Yes, he is a wholesale butcher next door to me.

493. Was that loss altogether on native meat?—Yes, nearly all of it.

494. Does he buy the best class meat it is possible to obtain?—Yes.

495. And gives the highest price for the cattle?—That is so.

496. So that what you desire to convey to the Committee is that here is one man in the trade buying native meat who within 18 months loses 363*l.* through confiscation and has now taken to buying foreign meat?—Yes, he buys a large amount of foreign cattle as well.

497–8. Is he buying more foreign cattle because of that fact?—That is so.

499. Is it your opinion, that giving compensation would diminish the number of tuberculosis animals, would it help, do you think, to get rid of tuberculosis in animals?—Yes, I believe if Imperial compensation were granted, that the buyers would be open to Imperial inspection, and that in time it would diminish the disease considerably.

500. Is it your opinion that the present system is a premium on discouraging, disclosing the fact that there is tuberculosis in animals?—Yes.

Chairman.

501. The mere fact of giving compensation would not bring any change about, would it?—I fancy it should. Cattle should be inspected by an Imperial inspector as to the way they are kept and fed, as well as being inspected by an Imperial inspector after they are slaughtered.

502. But then there would have to be a provision, would there not, that compensation should not be granted unless the inspector found the premises had been suitable?—You could deal with the farmer then; the feeder.

503. You said also, did you not, that you thought anything confiscated for the public good, the public should pay for?—That is my opinion.

504. Rotten fruit is confiscated for the public good, to prevent diarrhoea, is it not. Ought that to be paid for by the public?—I think a party buying rotten fruit, except he bought it in bulk from foreign countries, would see it was bad.

Chairman—continued.

505. If his fruit is condemned on public grounds, as you say, for the good of the public, do you think the public ought to compensate him or not?—No, I do not think they should; if he buys rotten fruit he ought to bear the consequences. He can see it is rotten fruit, surely. I think a man buying fruit could see whether it was rotten or not.

506. Do I understand that at Paisley where the system is that they pay 1*s.* a beast on each side, that is to say, the buyer pays 1*s.* and the purchaser pays 1*s.*, at that market they deal mainly in cows and bulls, and not the best class of animals?—That is so; it is quite a little suburban sale. There may not be a dozen cows sometimes there altogether.

507. Though the public might be willing to compensate a man of skill if he made a mistake, do you think that the public ought to compensate a beginner at the trade for his want of skill in buying a beast that was wrong?—I do not know. I think he soon acquires skill if he has any time at it at all.

508. You see the public, as represented in this room, might be willing to risk their money on your not making a mistake; but ought they to be compelled to risk their money on every other man making a mistake?—A non-skilled buyer of that class would have a very short period in the trade.

509. Not if he was compensated for his mistakes; he might remain in the trade a long time then, might he not?—Quite so.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

510. But the point is, is it not, that he does not claim compensation unless he can satisfy the magistrate that he has made no mistake?—That is so.

511. That the accident which had occurred would occur to the most skilful man in the trade, I understand?—Yes.

Chairman.

512. Do you only claim compensation in the case of a man who has bought a beast, exercising the greatest possible skill which could be displayed in the trade?—Certainly. If it was a chance beast I would not compensate him.

Dr. Farquharson.

513. Mr. Field asked a question about warranty. Who would give the warranty?—We have no warranty.

514. But supposing you had a system of warranty as has been suggested, who would give the warranty?—It would be a matter of arrangement.

515. The farmer would have to do it, would he not?—It would be a difficult job to trace some of the cattle back to the farmer; some of them pass through five or six hands.

516. But the farmer cannot warrant an animal free from disease which is practically undetectable, can he?—No, he cannot.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

517. But if you buy a bad horse you send it to Aldridge's and sell it again, do you not?—Certainly, and the next man gets the benefit.

518. But

23 June 1904.]

Mr. WEBSTER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Gray—continued.

518. But if you buy a diseased cow, the local authority seizes it and destroys it?—Yes, it is not sold a second time.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

519. With regard to the suggestion that it might be fairer to get compensation from an Imperial fund rather than from local rates, could you tell us what proportion of the meat killed in Glasgow is consumed in Glasgow?—There is a large proportion certainly, but as I say there is a large district round about Glasgow for 20 miles, which is supplied from Glasgow. I could not give you figures, but there is a large quantity of the beef consumed outside Glasgow.

520. Supposing the ratepayers of Glasgow were made to pay the compensation, do you

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

think that half the meat would be consumed by themselves?—Much more than half is consumed in Glasgow; more than three-quarters of the meat killed in Glasgow is consumed in Glasgow. In the summer season, of course, a lot goes outside Glasgow, but in the winter it is mostly consumed in Glasgow.

521. As regards the other fourth, they would be paying for a precaution for the benefit of the ratepayers outside their district, would they?—Yes.

Mr. Kilbride.

522. Does not the same thing apply to several towns in Lancashire?—Yes.

MR. WILLIAM RAMSDEN, called and Examined:

Chairman.

523. Are you a wholesale butcher and cattle salesman in Liverpool and Manchester?—That is so.

524. Have you been in business for 50 years?—Yes.

525. And have you had large experience in slaughtering cattle?—Yes.

526. Are you Chairman of the Liverpool Abattoirs Company?—Yes.

527.—Where a large number of livestock is slaughtered daily, and have you personally observed a large amount of bovine tuberculosis in those cities?—Yes.

528. Have you also been in the United States?—Yes, on several occasions.

529. And in Canada?—And in Canada.

530. When you were out there, did you inquire into the question of compensation for animals seized for tuberculosis?—I inquired what was the system adopted in the United States with regard to condemnation of meat, but I did not inquire with regard to compensation.

531. Are you conversant with the action of the authorities in Canada and America on the subject of inspection of meat?—Yes.

532. And of course a great deal of that meat comes to England, does it not?—A great portion of it comes to England.

533. Will you tell the Committee your own personal experience as a wholesale butcher. How many beasts are you killing a week?—It varies very much just at present, but I am a member of a firm which has slaughtered 500 cattle per week. In the Liverpool abattoir, which deals entirely with native production, there are not so many beasts being slaughtered at present in consequence of the action of the local authorities in Liverpool.

534. Do I understand you to say you have stopped slaughtering?—No, but we do not slaughter so many. There are, perhaps, 800,000 animals slaughtered on our premises every year on an average. The number—1903—was 788,000.

535. Can you give the Committee any idea of the percentage of those that are condemned for

Chairman—continued.

tuberculosis?—When I give you the number of 800,000, I wish the Committee to understand that a very small portion of them are cattle; the figure represents sheep, lambs, and calves as well.

536. How many cattle would there be in that number, do you suppose?—We average 150 a week only, at present; we have averaged 1,400 and 1,500.

537. Would it be a fair thing to say that 1 in 100 of those cattle were seized as tuberculous?—Not one per cent.

538. I suppose the percentage in pigs would be higher, would it?—It is a little higher, but that depends greatly on the action of the Meat Inspector and the opinion of the Medical Officer of the City. Now, in Liverpool, if the neck gland of one of the pigs is affected, the whole carcase is condemned no matter how large or good the pig may be. In Manchester, Birmingham, St. Helens and Warrington, and all those places where a large number of pigs are slaughtered, if the neck gland is the only gland which is affected they take the head and condemn that, and the rest of the carcase is allowed to be sold for food.

539. Do you think as regards pigs about 1½ per cent. would be condemned?—Not quite so many as that.

540. Are they Irish cattle, mainly, which you slaughter?—They are chiefly Irish cattle which we slaughter at the Liverpool abattoirs. Very few cows that are kept within the City are slaughtered. We have 7,000 cows in the cow-sheds of the City, and not one per cent. of those comes to our place in consequence of the action of the Inspectors.

541. With regard to insurance, have you ever tried mutual insurance at Liverpool?—Never at Liverpool. It has been tried at St. Helens and Warrington, and various other towns adjacent to Liverpool and within 18 miles, but all the Insurance Companies thus started came to grief.

542. Were those general insurance companies or were they farmers' mutual associations?—

They

23 June 1904.]

Mr. RAMSDEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued..

They were mutual, some instituted by the farmers, and some by the butchers.

543. For the special purpose of insuring against the meat being seized for tuberculosis?—For the special purpose of insuring against the meat being seized for tuberculosis.

544. And they have come to grief, have they?—Yes.

545. From failure of cash or quarrelling amongst members?—The funds were never sufficiently large to cover one year's loss. The purchasers paid one shilling per animal to a treasurer, and they never got sufficient to compensate those who made application for loss of animals, consequently they came to grief.

546. You are perhaps aware that evidence has been given before a Royal Commission that the Newcastle Mutual Insurance arrangement in which the levy was 1s. for a bullock and 1s. 6d. for a cow, returned 80 per cent. of the money subscribed for several years. Have you read particulars as to that?—No, I do not know anything about Newcastle.

547. Did you hear the evidence of the last witness?—I only heard a portion of it.

548. Did he say anything while you were in the room with which you disagree?—Yes.

549. Will you kindly tell the Committee what that was?—It was in reference to compensation of 8l. for animals. I think the question was put to him, did he think tuberculous disease would diminish in consequence of compensation. I did not agree with his answer, because it could not have any effect whatever in the reduction of tuberculosis.

550. Do not you think it would be possible it might have the effect of increasing the amount of tuberculosis by making people careless if they were to be compensated for their loss if the animal was tuberculous, might not it make them more careless about the conditions under which they kept their animals?—The conditions which are imposed now are sufficient to protect them if there is any disease lurking in the animal. Cows, of course, that are fed on brewers' grains, if there is the germ of disease in them, develop it immediately in consequence. The disease would be there, no matter whether there were compensation or not.

551. I do not suppose paying money would ever cure an internal disease, but the point is this: if the butcher got compensation for these carcasses I suppose he would, in justice, pay the farmer more for the beast, because a risk had been removed?—Naturally; and you had to discount something for the disease. Unfortunately, in the district of Liverpool, the very best butchers have been driven out of the trade altogether, and buy their meat at Birkenhead owing to the serious risk. I know of several instances of the very best butchers who bought nothing but the very best they could lay their hands on; but have had to buy foreign meat in consequence of one or two having a very narrow squeak of being prosecuted. They bought some Scotch cattle which were found to be diseased and on their premises, and it was only by some influence which was brought to bear on the authorities that they were not proceeded against in a criminal court.

Chairman—continued.

552. Would you think the butcher would give the farmer more for the beast, if the risk of loss by seizure were eliminated by compensation?—Undoubtedly; he would not have to make so much discount. If he bought 100 or 50 or 10 cattle, he must naturally say "there is a certain amount of risk in these" and allow for it, but if he knows he is going to get compensation undoubtedly he would give a better price.

553. Largely better?—Not very largely better.

554. Because he would not think the risk was a very serious one, I suppose?—He would not think the risk would be so serious as it is now.

555. Then if the farmer got a better price in the case of compensation, and a worse price because of the risk, if the risk was removed would it not have the effect of making the farmer less particular about tuberculosis?—The farmer does not produce the disease, the disease is in the animal. If he buys the cattle young for feeding purposes, the disease must be lurking in the system of the calf or the young heifer or bullock.

556. Do not you think the conditions under which the animal is kept have an effect on the question of development of disease?—Not so much. The conditions under which cattle are kept now are very much superior to what they were 25 years ago.

Sir Mark Stewart.

557. What is the limit of compensation that you would give for a cow; would you give anything under 8l.?—Certainly nothing less than 8l.

558. And what would be your limit for a bullock?—Nothing over 25l.

559. If a bullock were sold at 10l., in the market, say, would you consider that if that animal was found diseased and compensation had to be given, that 10l. should be allowed?—If the value of the beast was 10l.

560. If he was sold for 6l., would you allow 6l.?—No, I certainly should not include anything under 8l.

561. For a bullock?—Yes, we get little bullocks, you know, though we very rarely get anything so low down as 8l.

562. You would go down to 8l. for a bullock, would you?—Yes, 8l. and upwards.

563. And for a cow, how much?—I should make no distinction between the two.

564. Have you any opinion where the compensation ought to come from?—I should think it would be very hard on certain towns if the whole of the compensation had to be raised from the local rates. I think one half of it might be found by the Imperial Exchequer, and the other half should be levied on the district where the cattle are produced.

565. But supposing you had Scotch cattle, would you levy it on Scotland?—Yes.

566. The half?—The half.

567. And you would only charge the local rate the half, do I understand. Is that because a considerable number of cattle go out of the locality into the adjoining districts?—There is a very large number of cattle slaughtered at, we will say, Birkenhead, which is the largest slaughtering town in the United Kingdom, but they

23 June 1904.]

Mr. RAMSDEN.

[Continued.]

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

they are nearly all imported cattle. I understand it is not the intention that they should be included for compensation.

568. Is the reason you think that the locality ought to bear one half and not more than one half, because the whole amount slaughtered is not consumed in the locality?—You see there must be some action taken to destroy tuberculosis. To my mind it is easy to deal with it, as it has been easy to deal with many other epidemics we suffer from in England.

569. What would be your remedy?—All bulls should be registered after being tested, and submitted to see whether they are affected with the germ of tuberculosis.

570. How can it be found out?—By the tuberculine test.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

571. You have been questioned as to the value below which compensation should not be paid. Are you familiar with the Bill before the Committee?—I have seen a copy of it.

572. The Bill suggests that there should be no fixed price; is not that so?—Yes, but I understood it was likely to be amended, and that 8*l.* was to be the minimum.

573. But the Bill as a matter of fact does not suggest a fixed price. The Bill suggests that the Board of Agriculture should, from time to time, fix the price which should be paid, and below which no compensation should be claimable; is not that so?—Yes.

574. Is not that, in your judgment, a far fairer plan than attempting to fix to-day a price below which compensation should not go?—To my idea it would be better to have a specific price named, and not leave it to the fluctuations of the markets. At some seasons of the year a beast may be fairly worth 10*l.*, and perhaps three months later it is worth 12*l.*, 13*l.*, or 14*l.*

575. Is it not the fact that if you fixed 8*l.* as your minimum it might shut out at one season of the year people who at another season might well claim?—It might, certainly.

576. And it might let in some people at one season of the year who at another season would have no claim, might it not?—That would be so.

577. That is to say, there would be a danger in fixing a price, would there not; and ought not the price of an animal to have some regard to its size?—We buy them by the bulk.

578. Then would it not be fairer if you are going to fix a definite price, to fix the prices by hundred-weight rather than per animal?—I daresay it would, it would greatly depend on those who have the regulation of the price at the Board of Agriculture.

579. Of the two systems, that of fixing the price from time to time, or fixing the price per hundredweight, which would you prefer?—I think I would limit it still to the specific sums that we have named.

Sir Mark Stewart.

580. If you fix the price per hundredweight, it would depend on the quality of the beasts, would it not?—Of course, it would.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

581. With regard to the question of compensation and bringing about a reduction in the extent of the disease, at the present time tuberculosis is not compulsorily notifiable, is it?—When we find beasts infected when slaughtered, we are bound to give notice.

582. I am speaking of the live animal?—In the live animal we are not bound to give notice.

583. The farmer then has no direct interest in trying to stamp the disease out, has he?—He has no direct interest.

584. Except in so far as he may get a smaller price for his animals. If compensation were paid out of Imperial or local funds, would not the local authorities have a very strong interest in seeking to stamp out the disease in order to avoid paying compensation?—Naturally they would make an effort, I think, to reduce it.

585. Various witnesses have told us that much of the disease depends on the manner in which the cattle are brought up. Do I understand you yourself do not attach as much importance to that; but you yet admit, do you not, that it has something to do with it?—Considerably, but not to that serious extent. I do not know what previous witnesses have estimated it at. Now in Liverpool we are bound to have 800 cubic feet for each cow kept in the cow-sheds, but that does not apply outside Liverpool. All the farmers that are now feeding cattle and sending milk have come to the opinion that it is necessary to have very different cow-sheds to those they had 25 years ago.

586. To put it briefly, if the local authority had a direct interest by having to pay compensation it would insist on having closer inspection, would it not?—Undoubtedly.

587. And on better sanitary conditions?—Yes.

588. And, in fact, to protect its own purse, would try to stamp out the disease?—It would have a very considerable effect.

589. A local authority at the present moment has not that keen interest which arises when its purse is touched?—I am not aware that any local authority takes any action on the subject—municipalities do.

590. With regard to a mutual insurance fund in Liverpool, I understand you to say, if the thyroid gland is affected the whole of the carcase is destroyed?—That is so.

591. Can you give me any town very close by Liverpool where only a portion of the carcase would be destroyed under those circumstances?—St. Helens and Warrington.

592. Taking Liverpool and St. Helens, assuming the butchers in St. Helens and in Liverpool are contributing to one insurance fund, and assuming that that fund attempted to cover the butchers in both places, the Liverpool butcher runs a far greater risk of loss than the St. Helens butcher, does he not?—Undoubtedly so.

593. And therefore would have to pay a far higher premium, or the insurance would be very unjust as between the two men?—Yes, and that is the difficulty of trying to arrange an insurance fund, because of the various systems which are adopted in the various towns.

D

594. Therefore

23 June 1904.]

Mr. RAMSDEN

[Continued.]

Mr. Gray—continued.

594. Therefore, in order to make any insurance fund workable, it would be essential, would it not, that there should be the same system of destruction exercised?—There should be uniformity of system of meat inspection throughout the country.

595. Or the alternative would be a purely local fund, I suppose?—Yes.

596. Have you any experience yourself of insurance funds limited in extent to comparatively few people. I have had no experience of any of those insurance funds, beyond the fact of knowing of them from my position in dealing with these men in St. Helens, because I am a cattle salesman as well as a wholesale butcher, and I sell a great number of cattle for Warrington and St. Helens, and other places.

597. Do you think from your knowledge of the trade that, in a small town it is at all possible to run a mutual insurance fund?—I do not think it is.

598. Why? Because the risk is uncertain?—You see there is the different action of the different authorities, and you cannot get an insurance company or an insurance fund to apply to all cases.

Mr. Loyd.

599. How long is it since the Liverpool authorities took to destroying the whole carcase if part were found to be diseased?—Ever since Professor Hawke advanced his theory—that was nearly 20 years ago.

600. Do you know Dr. Hope?—Yes.

601. Is he medical officer for Liverpool?—Yes. I was a member of the Health Committee at Liverpool for three years.

602. Used not it to be the practice at Liverpool, supposing that a single organ was affected, not to destroy the whole carcase?—That depends. If there is only one organ affected and the meat is good, the medical officer might permit the carcase to be sold with the affected portions cut away; but in no case do they allow any portion of an animal when once it is condemned to be sold. The whole carcase is condemned in Liverpool.

603. Has there been any change in policy in that way within the last eight or nine years?—None.

604. I was looking at an answer of Dr. Hopes, before the Royal Commission which sat in 1896. This question was put to him: Question 1019. "Supposing a single organ is affected, you would not consider it necessary to destroy the carcase." And his answer was: "Not unless, as may be the case, the flesh has also slightly deteriorated. In that disease, in the case of an extensive disease of the lung, for example, the flesh of the animal would probably be deteriorated." That made me think that the practice had, perhaps, become more stringent during the last few years?—Dr. Hope is a little more stringent than his predecessor.

605. Has that had anything to do with the butchers in Liverpool not having a mutual insurance fund, or is it that they do not suffer from the same amount of grievance that the butchers outside do?—I do not think that has had any effect on the matter whatever. We have never thought it desirable to initiate an insurance company in Liverpool.

Dr. Farquharson.

606. Are you in favour of the destruction of a whole carcase on account of a limited amount of tubercle in the gland or lung?—I am not in favour of the whole carcase being destroyed if the infected parts can be cut away, and it is a fairly good animal in fairly good condition. I do not think it is right. I do not think there is any danger in consuming it. I have eaten a great deal in my time of that sort of meat, and I do not know that there is any tuberculosis about me.

607. I believe that that is established scientifically, but I want your opinion upon this point, is the flesh of a tuberculosis animal not necessarily inferior in quality because the animal has had tuberculosis?—I have seen some of the very best animals very seriously affected with tuberculosis, but the beef has been the very best beef possible to get.

608. You think, do you, the meat has not deteriorated in consequence of the disease?—I do.

609. And you would not mind eating it yourself?—Not if it was good meat. If it had deteriorated in consequence of the disease, I should hesitate certainly.

610. Are there no insurance companies started for the purpose of insuring against tuberculosis in cattle, because there are plenty as regards horses?—I know of none, except these small insurances companies in the various towns like St. Helens. At Warrington also they have had three different insurance funds, but they have all come to grief. Horses you see are somewhat different. It is a daily occupation for a man to buy beef, but a man does not buy a horse every day.

Chairman.

611. A bus proprietor buys a horse every day, does he not?—Certainly.

Mr. Kilbride.

612. How do you arrive at the minimum of price for compensation; you put the minimum at 8*l.*, and the maximum 25*l.*, do you not?—That is so.

613. How do you arrive at these prices?—It is very rarely indeed that we have cattle which realise more than 25*l.*, and 8*l.* is occasionally reached with the West of Ireland cattle, the very small cattle that are fed on the mountains, which come in at the fall of the year.

614. If you have an 8*l.* limit, would you have the same price limit for bullocks as well as cows?—The bullocks I refer to are the mountain bullocks from the West of Ireland. Now a cow of 8*l.* is very rare, more rare even than a bullock, because we do not get many of them at Liverpool.

615. Which do you think would be better: to fix the compensation at a price limit, or to fix it according to the quality of the beef?—Something has been said about charging per hundredweight. There are not facilities all over the country to weigh live animals: it is only at a market where it is imposed upon the authorities to provide those facilities you could do it; therefore you can only judge the weight of a beast by looking at it. I think it would be difficult to work a system of so much per hundredweight.

620. Why?

23 June 1904.]

Mr. RAMSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

616. The suggestion in the Bill is more or less that the Board of Agriculture should have a perfectly free hand to make bye-laws or regulations. Do you think that that is a better suggestion, or that there should be a price limit put into the Bill?—I think a price limit put into the Bill is the better way. The other way I dare say would be workable, but it would save a great deal of trouble in arriving at the value if you knew what the price was.

617. Do you tell the Committee that in your opinion the way cattle are fed has not as great an effect in producing tuberculosis as is popularly believed?—The reason I gave that answer was, because we are living now under different ideas altogether with regard to the feeding of cattle. 25 years ago it was a common thing to see the roof of a shed with perhaps eight or ten inches of cobwebs hanging from it, which was thought to be an indication of luck and health and so forth. Now it is very different, and we seldom see such a thing.

618. Is it your experience that outfed cattle are freer from tuberculosis than house-fed cattle?—Out-fed are much more free.

Captain Jessel.

619. Under the present system of not giving compensation, do not you think the public are very well protected from the risk of eating diseased meat?—They are protected in some towns and cities, well protected, but there are other places where there is no protection whatever.

620. Why?—Because they have no meat inspectors. In the rural districts of Lancashire there are no meat inspectors.

621. Do not you think if we were to entertain the suggestion that compensation should be paid by local authorities, the local authorities would object to pay a large bill for compensation?—I dare say they would object.

622. Then do you think the inspectors would be so keen?—There is no inspection at all in the rural districts.

623. But taking a big town like Liverpool, do you think there would be the same amount of keenness displayed if the local authority had to pay the compensation?—I do not think there would be any change, no matter whether they paid a large sum of money over or not for compensation. I believe our meat inspectors and medical officers would act in the same manner, whether they had to pay little or much.

624. You do not think then there would be any risk to the public of a heavy charge on the rates?—I do not anticipate it would even put a very considerable charge on them. It would not amount to such a serious sum as to cause the municipalities to kick.

625. If it is not considerable, why do you ask for compensation?—Because it is a very serious matter for a man. He is buying cattle daily, believing that he is buying a sound animal, an animal which has all the appearance of being sound, and as soon as it is slaughtered it is a serious matter for him if it is found to be diseased. It is very serious for him if it occurs two or three times a week; he loses not only his

Captain Jessel—continued.

money but he is in very serious danger of going to prison. It has occurred that honourable men have gone to prison for it.

626. I quite agree with you, but is not this an ordinary trade risk, when a man goes into the business of butchering, is not it one of the ordinary risks of his trade just as a man who owns a ship may lose it when he sends it to sea?—But a man does not buy a ship every day in the week.

627. But his business is that of a shipowner?—But he can insure. There are provisions made for insurance in the case of a shipowner, but there is not in the case of a butcher, he acquires an animal to-day and at five o'clock the same evening it may be condemned.

628. But it is only a question of paying a premium, is it not. You can insure for anything, can you not?—We have tried it and it has never been a success wherever it has been into operation.

Mr. Field.

629. You were, I understand, President of the National Federation?—Yes.

630. And did you assist at a great many meetings in large towns in England?—Yes.

631. Did you ever attend a meeting where there was no complaint as to confiscation?—I was never at a meeting where there were not always serious complaints of serious losses which were sustained.

632. Is it a fact that that is one of the great grievances of the trade?—That is so.

633. With regard to 1 per cent. of cattle being affected with tuberculosis which are killed in your abattoir, were those mainly Irish cattle?—Mainly Irish cattle.

634. Is it your opinion that Irish cattle are more free from tuberculosis than British cattle as a rule?—They are more free.

635. They are not so homebred and not so much sheltered, are they?—That is so.

636. Is it a fact that several men in the trade who have bought Scotch cattle and Irish cattle, have dropped buying native beef?—Yes.

637. For what reason?—Because of this risk.

638. Is it a fact that two of the best known men in the trade in Liverpool narrowly escaped being prosecuted as criminals under the present regulations?—The best known men in Birkenhead.

639. There was a case, was there not, of your Company being prosecuted by an inspector named Wagstaff?—Yes.

640. What did the cost of the proceedings in that case amount to?—It cost the Birkenhead Corporation 1,900*l.* The members of my firm were all summoned at the police court. The summons was dismissed; it cost us 130*l.* odd to produce evidence to show the inspector was wrong. Then under the arbitration clause we had to go to an arbitrator to assess, or rather to get at the value of the bullock which was taken and destroyed. The Corporation promised me that they would not go to any very serious expense, whereas they got the most advanced men, professors from all over the country. When I got to know they had secured nearly every professor of importance I had to do likewise.

D 2

641. Is

23 June 1904.]

Mr. RAMSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

641. Is it your opinion that the present system throws the trade into foreign hands?—Considerably so.

642. And handicaps the native meat trader?—It handicaps the native meat trader, and it diminishes the number of customers for home production.

643. Is it your opinion that a large amount of the meat which is destroyed is simply wasted?—It is my opinion that there has been a vast amount of meat destroyed which ought to have been consumed, and it is positively sinful.

644. Have you any experience of what is done on the continent and elsewhere?—Only in America.

645. They are not so particular in America, are they?—They have a better system all through.

646. You do not advocate, I understand, compensation to the importers of foreign meat into Birkenhead?—Certainly not, not for anything produced beyond the United Kingdom.

647. Is it your experience that cattle being fattened having the preliminary stages of tuberculosis, fatten more readily than other cattle which are sound?—Some do; they feed very much quicker.

Mr. Field—continued.

648. Have you been a judge at royal shows all over the country?—Yes.

649. Have you seen some of the best cattle at shows which have absolutely got prizes which have been affected with tuberculosis?—Very seriously affected; some of the very best animals. It is only three weeks ago I slaughtered a boar pig which had never been beaten, and he was so seriously affected that when the inspector saw him he said: "Have you seen that pig?" I said "Yes," and he said: "He is very badly affected," and that pig had never been beaten in any show field.

650. What fund would you pay compensation from, an imperial fund or otherwise?—I think it should be divided, one half from an Imperial fund, and the other half from the local fund.

651. Have you had a good deal of experience with regard to the insurance companies in Liverpool and the towns around?—Yes.

652. Is it your experience that these insurance companies are failures?—Yes, they came to grief.

653. You would not advocate a mutual insurance company system as a policy to be adopted in regard to this matter, would you?—Certainly not.

Alderman REDMAN, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

654. I notice you mention in your proof that you know something about the system of compensation in the United States and Belgium. Is that from personal knowledge?—Only from book knowledge.

655. Can you refer the Committee to the books?—I am afraid not. I think Mr. Legge, who went very fully into the question in connection with the late Commission on Bovine Tuberculosis, deals with it. He acted as secretary to the Commission.

656. Then I am afraid your evidence will only be the reflection of these writings?—That is so.

657. Then that, I am afraid, is not evidence?—I would like to mention, however, that the deduction that we as traders draw, is that in consequence of the system adopted in the United States, we have direct evidence that the cattle coming from that particular district is much freer from disease than these at home.

658. May not that be accounted for by the out-door life of the cattle there. A cow coming from America may have lived all its life in the open air, and a home cow may be kept in an unhealthy condition?—There are certain periods when they are in stalls in America similar to our own. Perhaps in their very earliest periods they may not be kept so long in stalls.

659. You would not wish us to deduct, would you, from the mere fact that fewer beasts arrive with tuberculosis, that compensation would have the effect of curing tuberculosis?—No, but in consequence of compensation being given by the State funds, the State also, wherever compensation is given, insist upon certain conditions being

Chairman—continued.

observed, similar, as here, in the cases of foot and mouth disease, and swine fever. Here we give compensation, but insist that certain sanitary conditions shall immediately exist, and if they do not exist we refuse to give the compensation.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

660. You have been Mayor of Southwark, I believe, have you not?—I have.

661. As such, have you been able to watch the operations of the Public Health Acts?—That is so.

662. Do you hold a very strong opinion as to the public advantage to be derived from a system of compensation?—That is the chief reason why I am here to-day, because of my extreme views on the evils arising out of this disease. I am also a guardian, and I read the first paper that was ever read, I suppose, in London on sanatoria. It is in consequence of my long knowledge of this particular disease and the workings of it, and the suffering and poverty arising out of it, that I was in hopes that this question of compensation would arise, because I think it is likely to materially affect and ultimately to stamp out the disease.

663. Do you believe, in fact, that if the local municipal authority were called upon to provide funds to compensate traders, that they would at one and the same time insist on sanitary conditions?—Most certainly they would. Let me illustrate my point. In the early period of the Asylums Board we took none but the very poorest people. Subsequently, the Local Government Board allowed them to be open to any person affected,

23 June 1904.]

Alderman REDMAN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

affected, involving an enormous expenditure. The first thing that arose out of that was that powers were given to the local authorities to insist on certain sanitary conditions, whereby the disease could not be perpetuated. We have it in our books that houses infected with tuberculosis disease exist, and one person after another, for generation after generation, have taken the disease.

664. Do I understand your deduction from that is that you would apply the same rules with regard to the disease in animals?—Certainly we should, and we should ultimately stamp out the disease. I heard Mr. Ramsden's evidence, which I disagree with so far as the origin of the disease is concerned. I am here largely to protect the public. I do not care so much about the butcher, personally, but I think I should be taking up a very illogical position as a sanitarian, if I were not here, knowing what I do about the disease. We want to touch the origin, and directly we touch the origin we shall be able to get rid of the disease, and so there will be no compensation required.

665. If mutual insurance funds were brought into existence, how could the local trader avoid paying the premium and avoid also the loss?—Our experience in London is that London has a large number of slaughter-houses, and the risk that is run in having meat seized and the consequences to a man's position has resulted in a discontinuance of killing home beef. A man does not run so much risk with sheep, because the disease is almost an unknown quantity among sheep. Therefore he buys English sheep, avoids the English cattle, and buys that which comes from Deptford or Birkenhead.

666. He can avoid loss if he avoids purchasing English bred meat, can he?—Yes, and then if you institute an insurance company he would not belong to it; he would buy foreign stuff. He would say, "I run no risk," and therefore would not belong to an insurance company.

667. Does your experience coincide with that of previous witnesses, that these conditions are steadily killing the English trade?—Undoubtedly. It was only a little time ago that we had a preponderance of English-fed stuff. To-day I believe that it is about 52 per cent. foreign and 48 per cent. English.

Mr. Field.

668. In London?—All over England.

Sir Mark Stewart.

669. Do I understand your great point as to tuberculosis in animals is the fear of communication to the human race?—I accept the doctors' dictum, and act upon that. I do not know, as a sanitarian and a member of a public body, that I have any right to do otherwise.

670. And is it with that view that you come here to-day?—Yes.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

671. Do you support the Bill on the ground that if compensation had to be paid public authorities would insist on inspection?—Yes.

672. But it is a pity there is nothing in the Bill about it, is it not. Would you like to see something put in the Bill about it?—I should. I think if compensation is given, the people who pay the compensation have a right to be protected.

673. Exactly. Then the motive for inspection would be the expense on the rates. Having to pay the compensation, who would bear the

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

expense of the inspection?—I think that is a matter for the Committee, not for us.

674. We must find out if there is some practicable scheme possible. Have you considered that?—I have not given it that serious consideration which I should have done had I known the question was going to be put to me, though I do not see that there would be any grave difficulty. We have our present inspecting staff, and if some veterinary surgeons were appointed as chiefs, I do not see any insuperable difficulty about carrying the thing out. For instance, you have not the slightest conception of the work we already do in connection with our administration; it is much more heavy than this is ever likely to be.

675. For instance, Glasgow would have to inspect the conditions under which the cattle which came to them were raised in all parts of the country, would they not?—They inspect them now.

676. They do not inspect every byre all over Scotland, do they?—No, but there would be a system of notification. Where compensation has been paid and there is evidence of disease I believe every animal can be traced. I have not the slightest doubt about that in my own mind, and having traced it, the local authorities should have a notification of the presence of disease in that county or district or whatever it may be. I know of an instance where I have been drawing animals from a byre where they are invariably slightly affected.

677. That would require considerable additions, then, to this Bill, would it not?—Still I am obliged to you for giving me the opportunity of making this known, because I believe it is by far the most important aspect of the case. The House of Commons has admitted the principle through one of its Committees so far as the London County Council General Powers Bill is concerned.

678. May I take it, then, that you consider that this Bill, which provides no machinery for inspection, is a very incomplete measure?—It does not go as far as I want it to go.

Mr. Loyd.

679. Do you say that Mr. Legge, the Secretary of the late Royal Commission, published a valuable work upon all the different foreign regulations?—Yes.

680. Will you give the Committee the name of it?—It is entitled "Cattle Tuberculosis" by Legge and Sessions, and I think one very important point elicited is as to the percentage of oxen and cows suffering from the disease.

Mr. Field.

681. Is your object in coming here to tell the Committee that you believe that by the passing of this measure the evil of tuberculosis will be lessened?—Most undoubtedly. I have the strongest possible conviction on the point.

682. You come as a member of the trade, not so much on the compensation aspect of the case, as to put forward the idea of endeavouring to eliminate tuberculosis from cattle?—That is so. We have exercised inspection where districts have been very badly infected with disease. If you had seen our district 30 years ago and could see it now you would find the greatest possible alteration has taken place by the administration of the Infectious Diseases Acts.

683. Are

23 June 1904.

Mr. ROBERT BRECHIN, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

683. Are you a butcher in business at Glasgow?—I am a butcher in business at Glasgow.

684. Have you heard the evidence of the first witness to-day, Mr. Webster?—Yes.

685. Do you agree with it generally?—Generally, I do.

686. Is there any point of difference you would like to mention?—There is one little point regarding an insurance scheme which exists at Glasgow in connection with the Strathmore Auction Company, as to which he stated that full compensation was paid by that company in the event of confiscation. My reading of it is that only three-fourths compensation is paid of the full value of the animal, in the event of the animal being condemned; but if a portion only of it is condemned, full value is paid for that portion. I know the manager of that company very well, and he suggested to me on one occasion he was afraid it could not be continued.

687. I understood from Mr. Webster that he had announced he was going to give it up, but he told you, did he, he was considering it?—He said he was considering the matter; that was some little time ago.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

688. I have a letter from the superintendent of the Perth slaughter-house, which is as follows:—"Dear Sir, In reply to your enquiries this morning, the numbers killed here for year ending 15th May last are, cattle 4,002, sheep 24,016, calves 158, pigs 1,525, lambs 1,146. The numbers condemned are 27 cows, 13 bullocks, 1 bull, 8 calves, 6 sheep, 1 pig, and parts of 4 cattle and 2 sheep. I keep no record of the cause except where there is an appeal to the medical officer of health and the vet. There were 17 cases of this kind, but in none of these was tuberculosis the cause. So far as my memory serves me I detained two carcasses of bullocks for this and was not appealed against. Trusting this will suit you, I am, Yours Faithfully, David Young, (Superintendent.)" Is that one of your documents?—Yes.

689. Is that a letter which states the number of cattle slaughtered during the year ending the 1st May last, and the number which were subsequently condemned?—Yes.

690. Do you put that letter in?—Yes; I received it the other day in order to show the contrast that exists between Perth and Glasgow.

Chairman.

691. Do you mean in the rigidity of the inspection?—Yes, in Glasgow as compared with other places.

Dr. Farquharson.

692. Is Glasgow stricter, or less strict, than other places?—Much stricter. I find that in Glasgow there are in total and partial condemnations of cattle, one in every 34 cattle killed.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

693. Have you any other evidence of this character giving the number slaughtered during a certain period?—I have the figures as to Edinburgh. In Edinburgh there was one in 306 cattle slaughtered totally condemned for tuberculosis.

Dr. Farquharson.

694. Do you mean the carcass was condemned absolutely?—Yes. In Glasgow we have one in 34, roughly speaking, condemned totally and partially; a greater number of them are partially condemned than totally condemned. In Perth it works out to something like one in 2,000 killed. Over and above this, in Glasgow, we have a system of confiscation of heads and tongues of otherwise seemingly healthy animals, which runs the figures up to one in 17 or one in 25 animals slaughtered in Glasgow, the head of which is condemned.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

695. Do you agree as to the impossibility of covering this loss by mutual insurance?—Yes; it is unworkable so far as Glasgow is concerned.

696. Do you agree that if this system of municipal or imperial compensation were brought into existence it would assist in stamping out the disease?—I believe that it would ultimately do so.

Sir Mark Stewart.

697. It would take a very great number of years to do that, would it not?—Possibly it would, but ultimately I think it would reach that end.

698. Do you attribute the disease to hereditary causes or to local causes?—I am not quite sure. I think in many cases it may be acquired, and if there was more heed given to the breeding and rearing of cattle, the probability is we would have less tuberculosis in the country than we have got.

Dr. Farquharson.

699. You are familiar, probably, with the experiments of Sir Thomas Gibson Carmichael, who absolutely stamped out tuberculosis in his herd by isolation and open air treatment?—I am not aware of it.

700. Do you congratulate yourself on the superior strictness of Glasgow?—Oh, dear no; I do not congratulate myself by any means—it is the other way about.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

701. Have you read the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the guiding principles they laid down for the condemnation of meat?—Yes.

702. Do you think the Glasgow authorities go beyond those?—I think our Glasgow inspector is a law unto himself, and he has a very strong Corporation at his back, and they look approvingly on as long as we are the only sufferers.

703. The Royal Commission recommended that power should be given to the Local Government Board to issue instructions to local authorities, dictating what meat should be destroyed. Are you aware of that?—I am not aware that has been done.

704. If that was done and the local authority was thereby put under control and were not allowed to be unreasonable, do you think that would be a solution of the question?—Not at all. It would certainly be of great assistance if we had a uniform system of inspection throughout the country.

705. Uniform

23 June 1904.]

Mr. BRECHIN.

[Continued.]

Chairman.

705. Uniform with Glasgow or uniform with Perth?—I would leave the Government to lay that down, certainly not Glasgow.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

706. Are you claiming compensation not only for meat which you think might be eatable but which is destroyed as a precaution, but also for meat which is uneatable and which you would not expose for sale?—We claim compensation for all good animals bought in good faith at full market prices.

707. I know you deal in the best stuff and are ready to give a good price for meat, but I suppose there are people in the trade, are there not, with whom it is a great object to buy their stuff as cheaply as they can?—That is so; there are people prepared to buy third and fourth-rate meat.

708. Do you think those people would be as careful in their purchases, if they could recover compensation from the rates, as they are now?—The magistrate before whom all cases must come could keep an eye on them.

709. Could he?—Yes, he would require to have evidence that this meat was that of an animal that looked well-nourished and presented no sign whatever of disease.

710. If animals which satisfied all those conditions have been byre-fed, they are apparently much more likely to have tuberculosis than others, and I should have thought the tendency under the present system would have been to be afraid to buy animals which came from such places unless they were very cheap; under this Bill it would not matter, would it, because there would be compensation obtainable?—But if you did not buy these animals some one else would, where the system of inspection is less severe.

Dr. Farquharson.

711. It would not be very easy to slip past the Glasgow magistrate, would it?—They are very terrible people.

Mr. Kilbride.

712. From your knowledge of Perth, do you think the health of the people of Perth has been injured by what one might suppose to be the laxity of inspection?—I think not. I have no statistics at my finger ends, but I think Perth will show a lower death-rate than many cities and towns in Scotland.

713. Then is it your opinion that the severe inspection in Glasgow does not tend, generally speaking, to improve the public health?—I am not prepared to say much in that direction. I only know that I see a great quantity of seemingly first-class meat condemned which appears to me to be condemned unnecessarily.

714. In the cases you spoke of in Glasgow, where they condemn the tongues and the heads, sometimes is not the rest of the carcase allowed to be sold for food?—I have known the finest cattle on earth, practically speaking, having their heads condemned, which were otherwise spotless.

715. Do not you think that the removal of that particular part would be sufficient, without condemning the whole of the carcase?—The

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

Royal Commission have laid it down to a great extent.

716. I am asking you, as a practical man who knows the trade, for your own personal opinion whether, if you remove from the carcase the part affected, you think the remainder of the carcase would be good food?—It is a question of degree—I should say so.

Mr. Field.

717. Then do you agree with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, that where it is only a case of partial tuberculosis the other parts of the carcase might be eaten?—I agree.

718. Can you tell the Committee why this extraordinary system is adopted in Glasgow. I was not aware that tuberculosis affected the head and tongue. Have you sufficient veterinary knowledge to give us any clue as to why that peculiar custom has come about in Glasgow?—I have no veterinary knowledge. We have a veterinary surgeon there who has been installed as meat inspector for about four years, and it may be that he is anxious to indulge in heroics to approve himself to his masters; but the fact remains that he does what no other person in England does.

719. Are you aware of that practice prevailing anywhere else?—I never heard of it.

720. Are you acquainted with the death-rates in Perth and Edinburgh; are not they much less than in Glasgow?—The Edinburgh death-rate is considerably lower than Glasgow; Perth, I believe, is lower than either, I cannot say for certain.

721. Have you any recollection of a famous trial which took place in Glasgow in connection with tuberculosis?—Yes.

722. What did that cost?—thousands of pounds.

723. Do you believe that a great deal of the meat confiscated is simply thrown away?—It appears to me to be so.

Captain Jessel.

724. There are hardly any insurance companies dealing with this matter, are there?—There are none as far as I know. One company approached the society I represent some time ago, but when they heard the system prevailing in Glasgow they gave us a wide berth.

725. Do you think it is because the trade hopes to get compensation from public funds, that they do not start insurance companies?—No, we in Glasgow endeavoured to start an insurance company some time ago, but the owners of the cattle refused to co-operate with us; we could give anything we liked, but they would give nothing, and unfortunately they suffer nothing.

726. You are a butcher, I understand. Do you pay for your animals always at once?—Certainly. I might, upon that, say that recently my association, or one of its members, resisted payment for an animal that was bought, and slaughtered within half an hour of the time of purchase. It was bought at so much per hundredweight dead weight, and it had to be weighed before the price could be arrived at. The animal, as I say, was slaughtered within half

23 June 1904.]

Mr. BRECHIN.

[Continued.]

Captain *Jessel*—continued.

half an hour of the time of purchase, and within an hour was taken possession of by the Inspector and condemned. The seller rendered his account at an estimated price of 20*l.* for the animal. The unfortunate buyer consulted the Fleshers' Society on the matter, and they agreed to assist the buyer in resisting payment. The case came before Sheriff's Court and judgment went against the buyer all along the line. The sum was not sufficiently large to admit of us carrying the case to the Court of Session, and the only appeal we had was to the Sheriff Principal, but we did not think that was an appeal we could rely on and the matter was allowed to go, I merely mention that as showing

Captain *Jessel*—continued.

what we have tried to do. We are simply helpless, and have no redress.

727. Do you think if you had an Act making insurance compulsory (as in the Licensing Bill) on the trade, that would be a means or way of providing compensation?—I am afraid that would be less easily accomplished than compensation.

728. Is not the difficulty now that you only get very small portions of the trade who will insure?—Here is seemingly good meat confiscated in the public interest, and if the public must be protected to such an extent, the public, I think, ought to pay.

Tuesday, June 28th, 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Captain Jessel.

Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Price.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

MR. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR

Bailie WILLIAM FLEMING ANDERSON, J.P., called; and Examined.

Chairman.

729. Are you Chairman of the Health Committee of the Corporation of Glasgow?—Yes.

730. Were you asked to give evidence by the conference of municipal authorities which met in London the week before last?—Yes, they remitted it to the Scotch authorities to select three representatives from Scotland. We had a meeting in Glasgow of the various Scotch authorities, and I was one of the three representatives selected.

731. Was Lanarkshire represented at that conference of Scotch authorities?—I do not think so.

732. Your Corporation have also considered the Bill, have they not?—Yes.

733. Are they in favour of it or against it?—They are unanimously against the Bill.

734. On the ground that it would have a bad effect on the amount of tuberculosis in cattle?—Yes, it would not, they think, help to eradicate, but help to perpetuate tuberculosis amongst cattle.

735. It has been argued before the Committee that the Bill would encourage butchers to notify if they had a diseased carcase. What do you say on that point?—I think it would not have that effect at all. Of course in Glasgow we are in a peculiar position, as all other Scottish boroughs are; we have no such thing as private abattoirs; all animals must be killed in the public slaughterhouse, so that it is not left with them at all to notify.

736. Do you consider it is very difficult for them to escape detection if butchers have diseased meat in their possession?—It is an offence, and a criminal offence with us, if they slaughter on any private premises within the municipality. We have one veterinary surgeon and two assistants and fourteen capable inspectors, in spite of what was said by some of our Glasgow friends.

O. 16

Chairman—continued.

737. Is it your impression that it is difficult for them to escape detection if they have diseased meat?—In Glasgow it is, but we are troubled with carcases being brought from the immediate surrounding districts as dead meat.

738. Have you noticed that this is a proposal that there should be fixed a minimum of price, an animal purchased below that minimum not to be compensated for?—Yes, and I think that is a very serious blot upon the Bill. Fixing any minimum is a bad thing, because where there are private abattoirs, if a butcher knows that his animal was purchased under the minimum, it is not to his interest to notify the authorities of the presence of the tuberculosis, because the Bill would give him no compensation.

739. What is your rule in Glasgow about the condemnation of carcases, do you follow the Report of the Royal Commission?—Yes, we do, except in the case of pigs, when we are not quite so stringent as the Commission upon Tuberculosis recommends.

740. To return to the fixing of the minimum price, do you see some difficulty in arriving at the price; do you see practical difficulties in the way of fixing a minimum price below which no compensation should be paid?—I do not think it would be possible to fix a minimum price.

741. On account of the difference in the value of animals large and small?—Yes; you may get a good small animal or you may get a large inferior animal.

742. Could not you fix a price by the value per hundredweight or per stone of meat?—It might be done. We take it that the principle of compensation as recognised by Parliament does not apply here at all, because we are asked to pay compensation not at the time the local authority steps in, but at a time preceding that period.

E

28 June, 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

period. This Bill asks that we should pay compensation upon the value of an animal as if it were alive, when it has been killed for food and is found to be unfit for food; the Bill purposes that we should pay compensation at a point antecedent to our stepping in at all—a thing Parliament has never looked at hitherto.

743. Your position in Glasgow is somewhat peculiar, is it not, in that a vast number of Irish cattle and swine are sent to Glasgow for slaughter?—Of the home cattle probably 50 per cent. off the Irish coasts.

744. And what percentage of the swine?—Seventy-five per cent.

745. Are those animals sent from Ireland and slaughtered in Glasgow?—Yes.

746. So that if they were condemned and compensation had to be paid, it would be Glasgow under the Bill that would have to pay it, would it?—Yes, and because of our strict inspection, many Irish pig dealers now kill the animals on the other side and send them over as dead meat. We fear that if this Bill went through we would then be inundated with those carcasses which may be shipped to us alive instead of coming dead, knowing that we cannot inspect them so well.

747. I understand they are sold on commission, so that the loss at present falls on the person who owns them on the other side of the Channel, does it not?—That is so; they are sent for sale on commission.

748. As a matter of fact, within your jurisdiction you raise no cattle, do you?—Absolutely none.

749. Do you maintain that the cattle from Ireland are just as much foreign to your citizens as the foreign cattle which it is proposed to exclude from the Bill?—Quite as much.

750. Then as to what is done with the carcasses, I understand yours is a great distributing centre, is it not?—Yes, very large.

751. So that not only are cattle reared outside your jurisdiction, but they are eaten outside your jurisdiction too?—A very large proportion.

752. Can you give the Committee any idea of the percentage which goes outside Glasgow after slaughter?—I do not think it is possible for anyone to give that without going carefully over the books of a great number of dead meat merchants. From Lanarkshire, Ayrshire, Renfrewshire and Dumbartonshire live stock is brought into Glasgow and killed, and if this Bill went through we should have to compensate the people who reared the animals, and after having secured a comparatively good meat supply, it would go back to the various counties from which the animals were imported, so that the Glasgow ratepayers would have to pay compensation in order to give the counties a good meat supply. Already I think we pay plenty in that respect; our inspection costs the butchers and merchants not a half-penny, while the ratepayers pay 3,000*l.* a year to maintain that inspection.

753. If the funds came from the Imperial Exchequer, would your objections to the Bill be altogether removed?—No, they would not be one whit removed so far as the Corporation of Glasgow is concerned.

Chairman—continued.

754. Is your objection that you regard it as an ordinary trade risk?—It is entirely a trade risk, we consider.

755. Then how ought it to be met by the butcher?—As all other trade risks are met; mutual insurance is one of the ways. Our veterinary surgeon has prepared two tables, which I shall be pleased to hand in, showing the necessary insurance that would be required to be paid by the trade upon the various animals. For instance, on swine the loss to the trade on account of tuberculosis during the year 1903 was equivalent to 3*4**1**d.* per pig slaughtered.

756. Was this in Glasgow?—Yes, this is entirely made up from our own returns.

757. Will you give the figure for bulls and for cows?—The loss to the trade on the 395 bulls slaughtered during the year 1903 in the Milton and Victoria Street abattoirs was equivalent to 15*1**9**d.* per bull slaughtered. If the buyer and seller had each given 9*d.* per bull, it would have covered all the loss and left a balance of 4*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* Then upon home cows no estimate can be given as many of the animals returned as tubercular were consigned to either of these abattoirs by the stock owners on account of their unthrifty condition. To estimate, therefore, on the numbers totally or partially destroyed would be misleading, in so far as it would give a grossly exaggerated idea of the pecuniary loss to the trade.

758. In taking out those figures did you include the animals which were in an unthrifty condition which were not of healthy appearance before death?—No, all the animals that are brought to us, while they may be condemned practically for emaciation and many other things are all tubercular, and are included as being tubercular. (*The Table was handed in, vide Appendix A.*)

759. So that if those sort of animals were taken out, would the loss work out at a smaller percentage still?—The loss is comparatively small, if you exclude the cows.

760. Then do you say you cannot arrive at any figure as to what the insurance on cows would have had to have been to cover the loss?—You cannot. May I hand in another table which will show the Committee the difficulty. From the 2nd May to the 18th June, 1904, there were destroyed on account of tuberculosis 150 carcasses, weighing a total of 464 cwt. 3 qrs. 22 lbs., or an average of 3 cwt. 11 lbs., per carcass. This gives an idea of the kind of animals. Five carcasses weighed from 1 to 2 cwt., 83 weighed from 2 to 3 cwt., and 41 weighed from 3 to 4 cwt. Of the 41, you will notice that there were 29 carcasses weighing from 3 to 3½ cwt., and 12 from 3½ to 4 cwt.; 1½ carcasses weighed from 4 to 5 cwt.; 8 from 5 to 6 cwt., and 2 from 6 to 7 cwt. Of the 21 carcasses weighing 4 cwt. and over, 20 were those of cows and one that of a bull. (*The Table was handed in, vide Appendix B.*)

761. Do you suggest that this loss could be covered by the butcher requiring a warranty?—That is done in South Wales at the present moment.

762. Will you tell the Committee what the agreement in South Wales is?—Yes. This information is taken from the organ of the trade, the

28 June, 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued

the "Meat Trades Journal." This is the resolution which was passed: "On and after November 2nd, 1903, no live stock will be purchased by the members of the Allied Association without a warranty that such stock was free from tuberculosis," and right loyally have the butchers stood to the resolution. The farmers did not see it at first, but ultimately it was agreed to and is at present in working. This district comprises the Allied Butchers' Associations of Newport, Cardiff, Barry, Neath and Abergavenny, Mid-Rhondda and Swansea.

763. I see that you propose to refer to mutual insurance societies in Edinburgh, Carlisle, Newcastle, Paisley and Crewe. Have you derived your knowledge of the first four of those from the evidence given before Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission?—Yes.

764. That the Committee had referred to that and shall consider. Do you consider that if the Corporation of Glasgow were to guarantee the purchaser against loss it would have the effect of raising the value of the animal?—Undoubtedly we have seen that in our auction ring. When a cow has been put up and the price is hanging, the proprietor of the cow comes forward and says, "I am prepared to guarantee this animal as free from tuberculosis," and immediately the price has risen as much as 2*l.*, so that if the Corporation were to guarantee all the animals it would mean not only paying compensation, but raising the price of meat against our own people.

765. And that rise in the value of his beast would provide the owner with a very ample fund to insure out of it, would it not?—I think so.

766. Because if he said "this animal is insured against tuberculosis" it would have the same effect, I suppose. Then have you something to say about the authority who should pay. Do you consider it ought to come, if it comes from a local authority, from the people where the animal is raised?—Yes, if there is to be compensation at all, I think the person who rears the tuberculous animal is the person who ought to suffer.

767. But if there is to be compensation from a local authority, do you consider it ought to be the local authority where the cow or beast was reared, because it is that authority which ought to put in force the law as to sanitation in cow sheds?—That is so; we have no control over their cow sheds.

768. Do you think there might be considerable difficulty as regards animals that are transferred after slaughter from one jurisdiction to another?—Yes; I think that the Bill in that respect is absolutely unworkable. In Glasgow it would practically mean that we should require to have a magistrate sitting in our slaughterhouse, who would have an average of about 40 cases per day to deal with, if he had to judge the value of the carcasses destroyed.

769. On the point of jurisdiction, the magistrate who condemned an animal might be a magistrate, might he not, at some outside place to which the carcass had been sent after slaughter?—The magistrate, of course, who con-

Chairman—continued.

demned the carcass in Glasgow would be a Glasgow magistrate.

770. I mean a carcass which had been slaughtered in Glasgow and sent to Paisley, a magistrate would condemn it, and under the Bill would assess the damages on Glasgow, would he not?—That is so. There is one point I should like to mention, and that is that the principle of mutual insurance is carried on in one of our biggest auction rings in Glasgow by the Strathmore Auction Company; the buyer and seller each contribute so much per animal, 1*s.* a head for oxen, 1*s.* 6*d.* for bulls, and 5*s.* for piners as we call them, that is cows.

771. Does the buyer pay 5*s.* and the seller 5*s.*?—No, 2*s.* 6*d.* each, that is 2*s.* 6*d.* for the buyer and 2*s.* 6*d.* for the seller.

772. Is it 1*s.* from each party in the case of a bullock?—Sixpence from each party, I understand; but that can be verified. I only know the fact that there is an insurance system carried on by this important company in Glasgow.

773. When you say 2*s.* 6*d.* for piners, do you include all cows under the head of piners?—Yes. But when I say that I simply refer to the great bulk of the condemnations being amongst that class of animals.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

774. Have you any personal experience of the meat trade?—No, I cannot say that I have any personal experience.

775. Or in the buying or the selling of cattle?—No, none.

776. Would you mind giving the Committee your occupation?—I am a hat manufacturer in the City of Glasgow.

777. Then your information upon this subject is acquired as Chairman of the Health Committee, is it?—Precisely.

778. Do I understand you object to the minimum which is fixed in the Bill?—Yes, I object to the whole thing, and I object to a minimum being fixed.

779. What is the minimum fixed in the Bill?—I think it is about 8*l.*

780. Have you read the Bill?—Yes, frequently.

781. Is there any mention of 8*l.* in the Bill?—No, but I have read the evidence which has been given here.

782. But this is a material point, because you have told the Committee that you object to the minimum which is fixed in the Bill?—I perhaps should not have said that. I have the Bill before me.

783. You said you objected to the minimum which is fixed in the Bill, and I asked you what the minimum in the Bill is?—I take it there is no minimum stated in the Bill.

784. Then you do not object to a minimum which is not there?—No, the clause says the Board of Agriculture may fix a minimum.

785. Is not that a totally different matter?—I think not. If you wish to quibble about words it may be, but from a business point of view it is the same thing.

786. You told the Committee that one of the reasons why you objected to a minimum was that you might have a small animal thoroughly sound

28 June, 1904.]

Baillie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

and a large animal altogether unsound, do you not?—Yes, that is one reason against it.

787. Would that be your objection to a fixed minimum, such, say, as 8*l.*?—That is one reason.

788. But the clause in the Bill provides, does it not, that the Board of Agriculture should from time to time, on consideration of the whole of the circumstances which would be before the Board, fix the price below which compensation should not be paid.—Yes.

789. How, then, can your argument with regard to the small and the large beast apply to such a clause as that?—But there are other objections. I said that was one objection. The Board of Agriculture cannot meet every fortnight or three weeks and alter the minimum price according to the price which is current at the time.

790. I understand your objection really is to an 8*l.* minimum or any other figure?—I said I objected to a minimum price.

791. Do you object to the Board of Agriculture fixing a minimum?—I say the Board of Agriculture, unless it were meeting every week, could not do it.

792. Has the Board of Agriculture returns given to it periodically of market values?—I believe so.

793. In your judgment, would it not be possible for the Board of Agriculture to say what was a fair price to pay on the Glasgow market for a sound animal of a given weight?—I would not put it so high as that.

794. Do you think it would be impossible for an official of the Board of Agriculture to say "This is a fair price to pay for a sound animal"?—Yes, it might be, but I do not think it would work.

795. It might be possible before a magistrate for the official to state the price which the butcher paid for the animal was a fair price, having regard to the market conditions at that date?—I do not think that is possible, that is one of the objections to compensation; the magistrate would require to take the evidence entirely from the person who is to get the compensation.

796. I suggest to you that an official, not the butcher, but your own inspector, if you like, may certify that the price which is alleged to have been paid was a fair price to pay for a sound animal of that weight on that date?—How is he to know the price that was paid?

797. I say the price which is alleged to have been paid. I do not ask him to certify that that price was paid. Might not your own official with his experience of carcasses be able to settle it?—He might, but I do not think it is his duty at all. I do not think that is a veterinary officer's or a meat inspector's duty at all.

798. I will leave that point for the moment, at all events. Do you think any loss ought to be borne as a trade risk?—Certainly. I hold if this Bill goes through it will be endowing this particular trade, and not compensating them, for the ordinary principles of compensation do not apply.

799. Do you say that the butcher should pay a certain amount per head on cattle purchased

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

in order to insure himself against loss?—I would suggest that; but, as you say, I have no experience of markets, and, therefore, I would leave them to find a solution of their difficulty.

800. You were unable, I understand, to give the Committee the figure which represented the loss owing to the destruction of the carcasses of cows?—I have given the percentage and the loss so far as we could get it of animals condemned, either wholly or partially, in the table I put in.

801. I am aware of that, and you also told the Committee, did you not, "I cannot give the figure for cows—it cannot be ascertained"?—Yes, I read that from the print.

802. Then how would the butcher ascertain the loss likely to be sustained in order to arrive at a fixed premium that would guarantee him against that loss?—I do not think there will be any difficulty in striking an average.

803. Then if a butcher can strike an average, why cannot you strike an average?—Because it is not my business. It is no duty of the Public Health Committee to say what would be or what would not be a fair price for mutual insurance by butchers.

804. You were able to strike an average for bullocks, were you?—No. In this print we show by the number of bullocks condemned that a certain price per head paid by the buyer and seller would amply compensate the butcher for any risk he ran.

805. Was the figure for cattle 15*d.* and a fraction, and for pigs 3*d.* and a fraction?—Yes.

806. But when you came to cows you had great difficulty in finding a figure, I understand?—Yes, I say it is not very possible.

807. And although it is not very possible for you as the authority to find a figure with your experience over some years, you think the trade itself might very easily determine that figure, do you?—I think there is no difficulty for them at all. They are in the habit of getting out of so many tight places far worse than this.

808. You have told the Committee, have you not, that your practice is that recommended by the Royal Commission with respect to the destruction of animals?—Yes, except with reference to pigs; we are not quite so severe as they recommend.

809. Do you destroy the whole carcase when you find portions affected?—No.

810. You destroy portions, do you?—We act according to the recommendation. If it is a generalised case of tuberculosis the whole carcase is condemned; if it is local, where it can be stripped without detriment to the general carcase, we allow it to go, and I have given in the return the proportions.

811. In the case of carcasses condemned as tuberculous, is it necessary to destroy the majority, or would you say in the majority of cases which come under the notice of your authority a portion only is destroyed?—The proportion is given in the return.

812. I have not had time to examine the return?—Of cattle, out of 47,362 (and this you will

28 June, 1904.]

Baillie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

will see on the first page of the table) 15·80 were affected, and of that 15·80, 10·30 were partially destroyed, and 4·64 were wholly destroyed. In that figure is included cows, so that the carcase is passed where 75·6 per cent. of it is found to be good.

813. So that by far the larger portion of the carcasses are passed as good, obviously, are they not?—Yes.

814. Have you any estimate of the total value of the carcasses destroyed in any one year?—I am afraid, further than in that list which I have given you as a possible basis for mutual insurance, I have nothing.

815. On what page shall I find that?—In the second print. We suggest mutual insurance would cover it, and there is an estimated value.

816. Is the figure you refer to 761?—Beginning at page 1, I give 75 swine, and then going down I give the estimated loss on the various animals. You will see there I give the number of the animals destroyed and their probable value.

817. I am afraid you hardly give the Committee the value of the carcasses destroyed during the year?—If we had known months ago this enquiry was coming on, we might have given you the information.

818. What does a penny in the pound produce in Glasgow?—It produces fully 18,000*l.*, but we have so many pennies in the pound that the ratepayers are rebelling.

819. I understand one of the reasons why you object to any loss falling on the ratepayers, and why you think the loss ought to fall upon the trade, is that the ratepayers already are paying a large amount for the number of officials you are employing in the way of inspectors and so forth?—That is one reason, but the Corporation hold that this is a thing that the public authorities have no right to be assessed for at all. A man buys animals for the sake of profit, and he must run the risk of any disease that there may be. The clause under which we seize and condemn an animal also applies to other things. I will read the clause: "Any officer of the Police Commissioners or constable may at all reasonable times inspect and examine any carcase, meat, poultry, game, flesh, fish, fruit, vegetables, corn, bread, flour, milk, butter, eggs or other article exposed or being conveyed for sale or being deposited in any place for the purposes of sale." I do not see why you should take one thing and simply deal with it in this way. A man buys a lot of potatoes and they may be rotten, and we do not permit him to sell them, but we do not compensate him.

820. Do not you think it is fair to suggest that the public may well be called upon to bear the cost of protecting their own health?—Yes, I think it is a pity that we require to have an army of inspectors to protect them at all, more especially in the case of tuberculous, which is evidently a preventable disease. We destroy milk and prevent it coming into Glasgow if it is from a tuberculous cow, and we give the dairyman no compensation.

821.—You have nothing but public slaughterhouses, I understand?—Nothing, and if I had

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

my way there should be nothing but public slaughterhouses throughout the country.

822. You admit, do you, there are other than public slaughterhouses throughout the country?—I know there are in England, and in some places in Scotland.

823. Do you know that if meat be dressed in a private slaughterhouse, the butcher may detect the disease and will know of a certainty under the existing law, if he reports that disease that the carcase will be taken and the loss will fall upon himself?—Yes.

824. Do you think that state of affairs encourages the butcher to report?—I do not think it does encourage him to report.

825. It rather encourages him, does it not, to smuggle the meat off on the public so that he should not pay the cost?—I would not like to say that of the butcher. You must exempt Scotland from that.

826. You said in your evidence: "I do not think this would encourage a butcher to notify," did you not?—Yes.

827. But I understand you tell me now that the fact that the loss is going to fall upon himself when the animal is slaughtered in a private slaughterhouse encourages him to hide the fact?—No, I do not think I said it encouraged him to hide the fact; you suggested that.

828. It does not encourage him to disclose it, does it?—I think the fact that there is a private slaughterhouse is a temptation if a man thinks he can get a carcase through to get it through. I think if you fix a minimum and the animal is bought immediately between the minimum price there is also the same inducement.

829. I am dealing with the question of disclosure, not the minimum. You say you do not think the fact that compensation is payable would encourage a man to notify. On what do you base that conclusion?—I do not think I said that.

830. I am sorry, but I thought I took your words down at the time. The question was asked from your proof, and you gave the opinion that the operation of the Bill would not encourage disclosure?—That entirely referred to animals which fell beneath the limit of compensation.

831. But you know full well, do you not, that no one is putting forth any claim in respect of anything which is below the fair market value?—I do not know that.

832. Then you are not familiar with the evidence that has been given here?—Of course we only get it from the local papers and the trade journals.

833. Then you take it from me no question arises of compensation where a price lower than than the full market value is paid for an animal, and that is where the minimum price comes in. You do not press the question then, do you, of notification or disclosure?—I think if any man has any carcase, or any article of food which is not sound, he ought to be compelled to disclose it; and with us, if he does not, and tries to foist it on the market, he lays himself open to a very serious prosecution.

834. He ought to be compelled to disclose, ought

28 June, 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

ought he?—Yes, if he buys a thing which is not fit for the purposes of human food

835. You stated, did you not, that you had observed that directly a seller declared he was prepared to guarantee the soundness of an animal being sold, up went the price. I think you said 2*l.*, did you not?—Yes. I have that from one of the largest men in Glasgow.

836. Supposing any seller in the market at that time guaranteed the soundness of an animal would the price go up then?—I cannot say. I am telling you what one of the biggest men in the city in the butchering trade informed our Committee would be the result if this Bill went through.

837. You are giving us your experience as Chairman of the Health Committee and a man of considerable experience, and I want to put this to you: that when one seller is giving a guarantee with regard to his animals the price may well go up?—I think it is almost certain to do that. If a butcher in buying a cow knows that whether he pays 8*l.* or 10*l.*, if the animal is unsound he is to be compensated as the Bill proposes to the full market value, he has not the same desire to be careful, knowing that he is going to get compensation out of the public purse?

838. Does not it occur to you that this compensation would be tantamount to a guarantee given by every seller to every buyer, and therefore the ordinary market haggling would at once come into effect?—I do not see it in that light.

839. The sanitary authority in your judgment, I take it, ought to see that sheds, and so forth, from which the cattle come are clean and healthy?—If tuberculosis is a preventible disease, and I see that it is so stated, then I think it lies on the authorities of the places where the stock is reared to see that they are properly housed and fed.

840. If Glasgow were paying compensation and noticed that animals coming from a particular district were constantly diseased, is it not presumable that the Glasgow authority would notify the authority of the district from which the bad animals come and put them on the alert and assist them in stamping it out at its source?—We have more than once notified in connection with milk, but a good deal depends on the authority which you notify; sometimes we have not been very well supported in that direction.

841. Do you notify anybody now when you condemn carcasses?—Oh no; as a matter of fact, when the carcass is condemned we do not know to whom it belongs very often.

842. Then you condemn the carcass, and the loss falls on the butcher, and there your interest ceases, does it?—It goes a little bit further than that. The carcass is then removed to a diseased chamber, is taken away in a sealed cart, and used for commercial purposes, the proceeds going to the butcher.

843. So that you take no step to attempt to stamp out the disease, do you?—We cannot; it is not within our jurisdiction.

844. Nor to re-establish the credit of the butcher who has bought an animal in all good faith, perfectly ignorant of the fact that it was diseased?—I do not know that I can say any-

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

thing about the credit of the butcher, further than that of all the butchers in Glasgow that I know are exceedingly lucky men and are making money hand over fist

845. That as no doubt influenced your judgment in giving evidence this morning?—No.

Sir Mark Stewart.

846. Have you had any complaints or heard any complaints from the butchers in regard to this question?—As to the condemning of the carcasses, do you mean?

847. Yes?—They have in Glasgow a prominent veterinary surgeon whom they call in if they have any doubt as to the soundness of our veterinary surgeon's judgment, and that has been done in many cases.

848. Have they ever complained to the Corporation of the hardship to them of having their meat slaughtered without compensation?—In every case their own veterinary surgeon has advised them to sign over the carcass. We went so far, on my own suggestion, in order to prevent a butcher running any risk of being brought before the Court, of allowing him to appoint an expert in Edinburgh to whom he might appeal, if he was disposed to challenge before going into Court, whose judgment should be final.

849. But have you never heard any complaint from the butcher of the hardship of the law which gives no compensation. Have the butchers never made any appeal to the Corporation?—Not that I am aware of at all. We have three butchers on our Health Committee

850. Have they never made any protest?—No, and some of them have had on more than one occasion an animal condemned—not poor ones, but good American animals. They have simply looked upon it as one of the risks of their business.

851. Is it your view that it would be harmful to the rates of Glasgow if compensation was given, and would do no good in stamping out tuberculosis?—That is my opinion.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

852. The honourable member, Mr. Gray, cross-examined you as to your occupation, but you did not come here I understand as an expert on the meat trade, did you?—No, I did not, I come here to speak from a public health point of view.

853. Is the experience you claim experience of municipal work in Glasgow, and not experience on the butchering trade?—Yes; I entirely speak from the public health standpoint.

854. The Committee had evidence from the butchers in Glasgow that they thought the condemnation of meat had been more than necessarily stringent in Glasgow. Did you see that evidence?—Yes.

855. Has your intention been to work up to the spirit of the recommendation contained in the Report of the Royal Commission?—We have endeavoured to carry out loyally those recommendations, and from the fact that we have never had one case contested, I think it is a pretty good indication that the judgment of the veterinary inspector and his staff has been pretty sound.

The

28 June, 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

856. The Commission recommended in their Report that the Local Government Board should issue instructions regarding the condemnation of meat. I suppose you would be rather glad if instructions were issued?—Yes; we quite agree with this Report, and we should be very glad to get instructions. I have here a report issued in 1899, which guides our veterinary officer.

Chairman.

857. And which was sent to you by the Local Government Board for Scotland, I understand?—Yes.

858. With a note recommending it to your attention?—Yes. On page 5 it says: "Principles to be observed by meat inspectors in the inspection of tuberculous carcasses of cattle." The Royal Commission made the following recommendations, and one is: "The entire carcass and all the organs may be seized." Then it says: "The carcass if otherwise healthy shall not be condemned, but every part of it which contains tuberculous lesions shall be seized."

859-60. Did the Local Government Board for Scotland put a clause in that document with a quotation from the Report of the Commission recommending you to adopt that plan?—At the top of page 6 it says: "The Board have no authority to issue instructions, but they direct the attention of local authorities to the recommendations of the Royal Commission."

Dr. Farquharson.

861. It is only a recommendation, it is not an order, is it?—It is not an order.

Dr. Hutchinson.

862. Do you understand that there is a butchers' side to this question as well as a municipal side?—I realise that.

863. The butchers' side is that they are losing money by the compulsory slaughter of these animals, and not only that they are losing money but that they are being prosecuted for criminal offences, which does them an enormous injury in their trade?—That does not happen in Scotland. We never prosecute a man for having a tuberculous animal killed and the carcass being seized; the only thing we prosecute for is if we catch that carcass in transit or in the market with all the organs removed, being attempting to be foisted on to the public; then we step in, and the onus is upon the possessor of that carcass to prove that he did not intend it for public food. We have not to prove it was meant for public food, but he has to prove it was not meant for public food. May I say the fact that you have private slaughter-houses makes the position in England much more difficult.

864. Then is your answer to the butcher: "Your risk is practically nothing, except in the case of cows"?—Practically.

865. I see it works out in your list here that the percentage of tuberculous oxen is only $3\frac{1}{2}$, and cows $48\frac{3}{4}$?—Yes.

866. And in 1903 the percentage of oxen

Dr. Hutchinson—continued.

was under 4 per cent., and in the case of cows it was just under 50 per cent?—Yes.

867. So that what you want to bring out, is it, that the butchers buying these cows know the risk they are running?—Yes, I might say in that connection that in Edinburgh they have almost stamped out that animal altogether. Speaking from memory, in Glasgow we have something like 28,000 cows as against about 300, or under 400 certainly in Edinburgh.

868. Of course your evidence agrees with that of Mr. Coggan, who was one of the butchers' representatives. I put the question to him: "You personally, I understand, have had thousands of beasts through your hands, but you cannot remember a single case in which you have lost a penny because you have only dealt in bullocks," and his answer was "Yes," so that practically you agree, do you not, that this question is really a question as to cows?—That is so.

869. And if a butcher buys these cows and sells them as meat, the price he gives includes the risk he is taking. Is that your answer?—That is my answer.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

870. Have you formed any idea of what the total percentage of loss all over the country is?—No, I have not. I have no idea at all.

871. You are only speaking from the Glasgow point of view, I understand?—Yes, I am only speaking from the Glasgow point of view, and I do not know that it is evidence; but I am also authorised by Leith and Edinburgh, who wired to us, saying their position was the same as ours, to speak for them.

872. But taking the country all over, I suppose the percentage of loss is very much higher in Glasgow, is it not?—Evidently with us it is much higher than it is in Edinburgh, because they have been able to stamp out the cow killing trade.

873. Do you know that some attempts have been made with regard to insurance which have failed?—I hear such an institution was started in Paisley, and because of the way it was manipulated by the butcher paying a higher price to the farmer the insurance society got knocked up.

874. You speak of this as an ordinary trade risk. Does it occur to you that this is a kind of trade which is more individual, perhaps, than some of the trades which make mutual insurance of this kind the regular practice?—I do not think so.

875. As we know, in many trades risks are the subject of insurance, but generally they are pretty highly organised, are they not—take shipping and insurance against fire? They are much more on an organised basis, and the insurance of those risks is adjusted as part of the trade, is it not? Might not there be more difficulty with regard to these private slaughter-houses and individual butchers scattered all over the country in this trade, in insuring than there is in other trades?—I do not think so, and I am satisfied that insurance people, who are always looking for a new source of business, would find some method. I think there is scope for them in this particular direction if there is a grievance.

876. Do

[28 June, 1904.]

Baillie ANDERSON J.P.

[Continued.]

Dr. Farquharson.

876. Do I understand you to say that there are no private slaughter-houses in Glasgow?—None.

877. So that if a butcher wishes to indulge in any nefarious practices he has not a chance, has he?—No, he cannot. If they even kill a calf in a back shop it is an offence, and they are punished.

878. How often is the meat inspected in the various slaughter-houses?—Constantly.

879. The Committee have had complaints from some witnesses that the inspection in Glasgow is too severe; what do you say as to that?—My answer to that is that we have offered, knowing the difficulties of a butcher in a good way of business going into Court, whether he got a verdict or not, and the risk it would be to his business, to meet him in every conceivable way. What we do is, when we find a tuberculous animal, instead of taking him into Court we asked him if he is prepared to sign the carcase over. If he is, and it is signed over in the slaughter-house, there is an end of it, and in 99 per cent. of the cases that is done. Then we offered over and above that to agree to the appointment of an independent veterinary surgeon in Edinburgh, who, if butchers thought our officer had made a mistake, they could call in; and in the event of the officer's judgment being set aside, we would submit to the decision and pay the expense.

880. Then there is not much left to the independent judgment of the inspector, or of the persons we have spoken of as cranks who might condemn rather capriciously?—Yes, I noticed they were pretty sore with local authorities, but our local authority has nothing to do with it. We have three trained veterinary officers with 14 trained inspectors, who are all butchers save one, who deal with the matter in Glasgow. They have to pass a very severe examination.

881. Did I understand you to say that there is an appeal from the original inspector to a higher court?—If an inspector condemns a carcase Mr. Trotter, our chief veterinary surgeon, or one of his assistants is always inside the market, so that the butcher can appeal without any trouble. Over and above that, there is Mr. Robb, another high-class veterinary surgeon, who looks after their interests. He is briefed in their employment, and over and above that they have frequently called in Professor Glaister, our highest authority in Glasgow.

882. Did I understand you to say that the person who ought to bear the brunt of the loss should be the person who rears the animal?—Is not that a little hard upon a farmer who sells an animal which he considers to be perfectly sound?—As a business man I think if a man is prepared to take the profits of his business he should be prepared to stand the loss.

883. Are you prepared to admit that tuberculosis may be propagated by bad sanitary conditions?—Yes, and in connection with swine, I think we have a clear case in which it was propagated by insanitary conditions and ingestion.

884. Are not those bad sanitary conditions due to the imperfect inspection on the part of

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

the local authority?—Of course it does not do for me to criticise counties. I have no doubt it could be improved, but you know the difficulty of a sanitary inspector probably condemning the factor, or some other influential person in the county, and ordering him to do so and so.

885. But if the poor farmer rears tuberculous animals because he has bad houses which are not properly condemned, is it not obvious the responsibility ought to fall on the local authority which does not do its work properly, rather than on the poor farmer himself?—I think it would be a great hardship, if because the byres say, of Aberdeenshire, were not what they should be through the sanitary authority not doing its work, the ratepayers of Glasgow should be compelled to pay compensation.

886. It would be much harder on the farmer who is compelled to use bad buildings, which the sanitary authority will not condemn, would it not?—I think if there is any local neglect the local people ought to bear it.

887. You have admitted that there is often local neglect, I understand?—Yes.

888. Therefore did not the sanitary authority ought to bear the brunt instead of the farmer?—Of that particular district, yes.

889. Do I understand you to say there should be no compensation paid to anybody, because tuberculosis is a preventable disease?—Yes.

890. And therefore that the present conditions of things rather gives no stimulus to the farmer to try and stamp out tuberculosis?—It does not I think, give him any stimulus. What we have done in the case of milk might apply. In regard to milk supply, we have said we will not take the milk unless the dairies conform to a particular standard, and the result is the dirty insanitary dairies disappeared.

891. Do you think it is possible to disinfect a byre except by burning it down; how can you get rid of the bacillus of tuberculosis except by burning down the whole building?—I would go so far as to say if it cannot be stamped out unless by burning down, then you should burn down.

892. Do not you think the present way of treating cattle is responsible for the disease?—I am sorry, but after what has been said I must not venture an opinion upon that.

893. Are you familiar with the experiments of Sir Thomas Gibson Carmichael who stamped out tuberculosis in his herd?—I know as a matter of fact that Sir Thomas Gibson Carmichael did experiment for that, and I know that I desired all the people of Glasgow to get an amendment put in the last Public Health Bill dealing with the inspection of animals. I know Sir Thomas Gibson Carmichael is a scientific man upon that question.

Mr. Loyd.

894. You read a section just now under which your Corporation acts in these matters. Can you tell me what the section is taken from?—It is a section of the Glasgow Police Amendment Act of 1890.

895. Is

28 June 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Loyd—continued.

895. Is it a public Act?—No, it is a local Act but I think the Scotch Public Health Act of 1897 contains practically the same power. I have here the Scotch Public Health Act of 1897, and it says: "That any animal alive or dead intended for the food of man which is exposed for sale or deposited in any place or is in the course of transmission for the purpose of sale or for the preparation of sale," and then it goes on to deal with other articles. That is Section 43.

896. Have you any provision in the General Act corresponding to the Public Health Act, England, 1875, Section 116, saying that any inspector of nuisances or medical officer of health may seize certain articles of food, including carcases?—Yes, we have that; any policeman can seize.

897. Is that a power under the Public Health, Scotland, Act, 1897, or under your local Act?—Under both of them any policeman can act.

898. Have you any compensation clause providing that any person suffering, without default of his own, from any act done by a local authority in pursuance of the Act, shall be entitled to compensation?—No.

899. Are you quite sure there is not anything in the Act of 1897 to that effect?—I think not? I know we have never paid any compensation.

900. Have you ever had any proceedings taken against you by anybody on the ground that the meat in point of fact was not diseased?—No, not that I am aware of. Some years ago we had one or two police convictions appealed against, but they were sustained by the High Court.

901. That is a totally different thing. You are talking of cases in which a man was prosecuted for exposing food that was unsound. I want to know if your Corporation has ever had any action or claim brought against it under any compensation clause for the meat having been condemned, when in point of fact it should not have been condemned?—No, there was only one case I know of, and that was a case in which some person removed the entrails of one animal which were bad and put them against another, and the good animal was condemned because of the bad entrails being put against it. We have never paid any compensation on the ground of wrongful slaughter.

902. This Bill provides for compensation for the whole value of the animal, even though it is correctly condemned, provided that there was nothing ostensibly wrong with it before purchasing; is not that so?—Yes.

903. And you consider, I understand, that that is too much to ask?—Certainly

904. In your opinion, is there any intermediate position, short of compensating for the whole value of the animal; do you think it would be fair for the locality, in consideration of the greater security to health to be obtained, if they shared the loss in any way with the tradesmen?—No, at the point where the Corporation step in the animal is a condemned carcase unfit for human food. They are entitled to get the compensation which they now get. That is the value as a commercial product, but not as food. Under the Bill they want compensation as if the animal were a living animal; there is no act of the Cor-

0.16

Mr. Loyd—continued.

poration or any inspector which has interfered with it as a living animal; it is only after it is dead and has been found unfit for human food. If we confiscate that carcase as unfit for human food, they are entitled to compensation only for it as unfit for human food, and not as a live animal.

905. Do you admit that a great deal of extra caution has been introduced in the condemning of meat since science has been applied to this question?—I think so. It is only within the last five or six years that we have really appointed a qualified staff.

906. Can the butcher justly say that greater caution has recently been introduced than would have been introduced in condemning his goods in the ordinary course of business?—I can only speak for Glasgow. Since we have appointed this department there has been no change in its administration.

Mr. Field.

907. Let me refer you to the first clause of the Bill. "Whereas it frequently happens that it is impossible to detect the presence of tuberculosis in a living animal from its outward appearance, and yet such disease may exist to an extent which may justify the condemnation of the carcase after slaughter as unfit for human food, and it is expedient to make provision for compensating the owner of such condemned carcase." The object of the Bill is not therefore to provide compensation for a living animal, but for the carcase of an animal which has been condemned, is it not?—I see your point.

908. You are here from a public health point of view, I understand, entirely?—Yes.

909. There is a considerable difference of opinion with regard to the transmission of tuberculosis from animals to man, is there not?—I heard Professor Koch make a statement, and I have read the interim report of the Commission on tuberculosis.

910. And there is a considerable difference of opinion at the present moment, and the matter is under enquiry, is it not?—I do not think there is any difference of opinion.

911. I thought there was a Royal Commission inquiring into the matter?—Yes, and the Royal Commission have issued an interim report proving to demonstration the possibility of the transmission of the disease.

912. Are you aware that as a matter of fact, although you have no experience in the business, there are no ordinary means of detecting tuberculosis in a live animal under the existing market system?—I am aware of that, but the market system might be amended.

913. Scotchmen have the reputation of being shrewd, and do you think a shrewd Scotchman would go into the market and buy an animal suffering from tuberculosis and be caught afterwards at the abattoir?—In Glasgow there are a certain class of men who deal in this particular class of meat.

914. I am talking of men in a good class of business, who buy a particular class of meat?

F

—My

28 June 1904.

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

—My answer to that is, let them insure against the risk.

915. With regard to the class of animals that are confiscated in Glasgow, I happen to be in the trade, and know something about the weight of animals. Referring to your figures, out of the 150 beasts that were seized, 129 of them probably were beasts as to which compensation could not be claimed if there was a minimum price fixed; but an ordinary butcher would not call that beef at all?—Still they are bought and sold in the market.

916. But do not you understand that by this Bill it is not proposed to deal with this class of meat at all?—Then you have no case at all.

917. The question is that a man who buys a good bullock in good faith ought not to be subject to confiscation or prosecution?—I agree with you, but the figures prove that that does not happen in Glasgow.

918. Does not that prove also that you should have no objection to this compensation?—No, I think it proves the opposite.

919. You said, did you not, that the magistrate would take evidence from the person who was to receive the compensation?—I said so.

920. But as a matter of fact, does not the magistrate condemn the carcase not on the evidence of the man who owns it, but on the evidence of the meat inspector and the medical officer of health, or in your case the veterinary surgeon?—I think I am absolutely correct in my statement.

921. Will you explain it then, please?—The animal is condemned by the veterinary officer not as a living animal, but when it is dead and probably skinned and being treated, by the time the veterinary inspector comes upon the scene, and it is not possible for him then to discover everything, or I do not think so.

922. But surely it is on what the veterinary surgeon or the inspectors say that the magistrate condemns the carcase, is it not?—Yes.

923. Then you gave your evidence under a mistake, did you not?—No.

924. Are you aware that the London County Council in their Bill now before Parliament have a clause empowering them to fully compensate dairymen for cows which have been slaughtered and afterwards found not to have been affected?—I am not aware of it. I know the London County Council are quite opposed to this Bill, anyway.

925. Are you aware that the reason why men sign over carcases is in order to avoid prosecution and exposure?—But with us there is neither prosecution nor exposure; all that is done is the veterinary surgeon goes to the magistrate sitting in the Central Court, and states he has a carcase as to which he desires an order to destroy, because it is unsound. There is neither prosecution nor exposure.

926. Do the owner of the carcases condemned adopt your verdict and let it go unchallenged?—The bulk of them at the slaughter-house sign over the carcase in the slaughter-house, but perhaps the proprietor might not be in town or something of the kind, and the person in charge

Mr. Field—continued.

has no authority to sign over; and in that case we ask for the magistrate's order, but there is neither prosecution nor exposure.

927. If they did not sign over, what would be the result; would they be prosecuted then?—It is when they do not sign over we ask for a magistrate's order, and if they want to dispute the matter they can come to the Court and make their statement, and after having heard both sides the magistrate decides one way or the other. As a matter of fact, I do not remember in my experience a magistrate ever having the veterinary surgeon's statement disputed.

928. Do you remember a very famous case that occurred in Glasgow some years ago with regard to tuberculosis which cost some thousands of pounds?—No, I do not remember it; it was before my day.

929. You have stated in your statement that tuberculosis is a preventable disease, and as such no compensation ought to be paid for the seizure of a tuberculous carcase; what reasons have you for taking that view?—By my reading and my experience at the various sanitary congresses I have attended. There is a consensus of opinion that tuberculosis can be stamped out as it has been stamped out in some other countries.

930. But what is the reason why you would give no compensation?—I have said, Mr. Field, so often, because I think it is a trade risk; a man buys an animal for the sake of making a profit out of it, and if he happens to make a loss he ought to bear the loss, not the rate-payers.

931. Would not you take into account the fact that it cannot be discovered?—It can be discovered.

932. Yes; if you use the tuberculine test, but in many instances the efficacy of that test is doubtful, is it not?—Yes.

933. Is it your opinion the trade ought to insure?—Yes; or obtain a warranty from the seller.

934. If the sanitary authority believe it is a proper thing to condemn tuberculous meat in the interests of the community, why should not the community pay for it?—Upon the same ground as the sanitary committee shut up an insanitary house, the community do not pay for it. The sanitary committee prevent tuberculous milk coming into Glasgow and the community do not pay for it.

935. Do you hold the doctrine that anything taken for the benefit of the community should not be paid for by the community?—I hold against compensation when the community do not seize it unless it is unsound.

936. In the case of man who does not know a thing is unsound, and it is seized, do not you think it a hardship?—No, I do not.

937. You are clearly of opinion, I understand, that this Bill is not wanted?—Clearly, and it is the opinion of the Corporation.

938. How much would it cost, do you think, or would it amount to anything that would be important if you had only to compensate for the smaller number of your carcases seized?—Probably it might cost us in Glasgow, although

it.

28 June 1904.]

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

it is difficult to fix the figure, from 7,000*l.* to 8,000*l.* just now; but I believe that that might rise to any amount if this Bill went through. I know it would be so operated that the amount would be at once increased.

939. How long is it since the question of compensation assumed importance in the mind of the Glasgow corporation?—I never heard of it until I saw the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons. I know the butchers have been at the matter for many years, I know that at the great conference on tuberculosis the butchers brought persons from all parts of England and Scotland, and paid their fares in order to get a snatch vote emphasising the principle of compensation, but they could not do it. I think you and I met, Mr. Field, on that occasion.

940. Do you think it right that the individual trader should bear this burden?—I think the Corporation should not be made to meet a trade risk with which they have nothing to do.

940A. Do I understand you are clearly of opinion that this is a trade risk which ought to be met by insurance, and that the local authorities or ratepayers have nothing to do with it?—Yes, and it admits a principle for the first time which, if it is passed, I do not know where it is going to land us.

Captain Elliice.

940B. Do you think if this Bill passes providing for compensation, your rates will be increased very much?—It might be so, but I put it higher than mere rates; I do not think it is a claim which we have any right to face, no matter what it costs, whether it costs nothing or something.

940C. I see on the table you handed in that very few of the foreign imported animals have been totally destroyed?—That is so.

940D. Do you think if this Bill passes that percentage would increase?—Perhaps not upon those better class animals, but it certainly would make us liable for compensation, and the question as to swine would arise very seriously.

940E. Do you think there would be a tendency to send tuberculous cattle from foreign parts?—The tuberculous cattle from abroad are infinitesimal in number, but from Ireland, I think, if we were made responsible for the animals condemned, we should have a great increase of living swine sent here which at present are not sent here.

940F. At present the percentage of cattle that are actually destroyed is very small, is it not?—Yes.

940G.—Do the carcasses that are passed fetch the same price as meat?—That is a trade question that I would rather not express an opinion upon. But we do know that what we call a stripped carcass in the market does not fetch the same price as other meat. The man who purchases it gets it a halfpenny or penny a pound cheaper, because of its being stripped of the tuberculous parts, but we do not know that that person sells it any cheaper to his customers.

0.16

Captain Elliice—continued.

940H. So that the loss to the butchers is very small from the actual carcasses destroyed, I understand?—Yes, we say so.

Captain Jessel.

940I. In Glasgow you have very extensive powers for dealing with milk, have you not? Are not your powers more extensive than any body else's, that is to say your powers of proceeding against an owner who has a tuberculous milk cow?—We have this power, I think in a local Act, that if milk is sent on to Glasgow which we find to be in any way injurious to public health, either coming from a farm where there is disease in the animal, the udder of the cow, or where there is fever in the family, to stop it on the spot.

940J. And if the cow is found to be suffering from tuberculosis, can you have it slaughtered?—No, we merely say, "You shall not send your milk here"; we have no power over an animal unless it should belong to one of the farmers supplying our Corporation hospitals with milk. We have power to stop milk supply from any tuberculous cow, that is to say if the milk is injurious to health.

940K. Suppose it happens to be on one of your own farms, do you slaughter the animal?—We have no farms, but there are perhaps four or five farms from which we receive milk for our infectious diseases hospitals, and the animals kept there must be to the satisfaction of our veterinary surgeon, so that if there is disease in the udder or any part of the cow, or anything which he thinks is injurious, the animal must be removed from the herd; that is a special arrangement which we make with our dairymen.

940L. Do not you think it would be a good thing to have power to strengthen an animal like that; you have not that power I understand?—We have not that power.

Mr. Field.

940M. Are you aware that swine fever, pleuropneumonia, and foot and mouth disease are compensated for by the Government?—Yes, I believe so.

940N. Would you advise the farmers to insure against those diseases?—The Government comes in and says because of this cow having pleuropneumonia it is a source of infection to the other cows and they can order living animals to be slaughtered, and naturally they pay the price of the living animal; but in this case it is totally different, we only come in after the animal is slaughtered and has been found unfit. If the animal had not been unfit for food we would not have interfered.

940O. Would you advise the Government to have all the cattle that had to be slaughtered, examined?—I am afraid I am not capable of giving an answer to that.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

940P. I understand you put it that the Government comes in in the case of pluro-pneumonia and says "this animal is diseased, or it may infect another animal, it must be destroyed, and compensation shall be paid"?—Yes.

941. You

28 June 1904.

Bailie ANDERSON, J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

941. You come in and you say "this carcase is diseased, it may infect a human being, it shall be destroyed, we will not pay compensation, the loss shall fall upon the trader." Where is the difference?—I am afraid we are getting into an argument, but I think the difference is perfectly patent. We do not, and would not, interfere if it was not diseased, and when we interfere we only interfere because it is a diseased carcase and unfit for human food; if we confiscate that animal we then pay the price of a diseased carcase unfit for human food, not the price of a living animal which we had no control over.

942. In these very interesting figures you have put in, I do not observe a table showing the import of foreign dead meat. Have you such a table?—No.

943. Is it increasing?—I think we could give that information.

944. Is it increasing?—I cannot say; that is a point for the Market's Committee, which is a different Committee to the one I am representing.

945. Do you know from your work in Glasgow whether Glasgow has any interest direct or indirect in cattle breeding in Scotland?—We are interested in everything; we are not parochial entirely.

946. If the present condition of the law is tending to destroy the home trade and drive it abroad, would it affect your mind?—I am afraid I cannot answer that hypothetical question.

Chairman.

947. You summoned a conference of Scotch authorities, did you not, on the 22nd June?—Yes.

948. Was anyone from Edinburgh asked to attend?—Not that conference, because we had written Edinburgh some time ago, and they did not answer. They now tell me it was because they thought there was no possibility of this thing going through, and that it would be wasting time.

949. Did you summon any county councils to that conference or only municipalities?—What we did was to write to so many authorities, I do not remember really which they were at the moment, and those that replied we summoned last Wednesday in order to select three representatives for Scotland.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

950. Did you write to the County Council of Lanarkshire?—Yes, Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, Dumbartonshire, and Ayrshire.

Dr. Farquharson.

951. I think you told us that tuberculosis has been stamped out in some foreign countries?—I am told it is so in Denmark.

952. Do you know what means were taken to stamp out the disease?—No.

Mr. JAMES ANDERSON BAXTER, called and examined.

Chairman.

953. Are you the superintendent of the markets and slaughterhouses at Dundee?—Yes.

954. Are you also meat inspector?—Yes.

955. Are the Town Council of Dundee against this Bill?—Yes.

956. Largely on the grounds given by Mr. Anderson as to the unfairness of making them pay for meat not reared in Dundee and not eaten in Dundee?—Yes, very largely.

957. Have you some figures showing what amount of the cattle slaughtered in Dundee was sent out of Dundee for consumption?—Yes.

958. Did you slaughter 13,278 cattle last year?—That is so.

959. Of those, what percentage was sent for consumption outside the city?—18·58 per cent.

960. Out of those 13,278 cattle slaughtered last year in Dundee, how many were condemned for tuberculosis?—199.

961. In whole or in part?—80 partly, 119 wholly.

962. Making allowance for the carcases as to which compensation under this Bill would not have been allowable, what would have been the compensation payable last year by Dundee?—I

Chairman—continued.

reckon it would be between 900*l.* and 1,000*l.* in Dundee.

963. In Dundee have you a system of mutual insurance in the case of two firms of live stock salesmen?—Yes.

964. Will you give the Committee the conditions under which those live stock salesman insure cattle against seizure for tuberculosis?—We have only two live stock sales in Dundee, and both the salesmen have a uniform rate of insuring. The seller pays a premium of 4*d.*, and the butcher or buyer a premium of 4*d.* for each bullock or heifer approved by the auctioneer. If it shows signs of tuberculosis, of course he will not insure it, or if it is sold below 10*l.* he will not insure it.

965. What is the rate on cows?—For cows the buyer pays 1*s.* and the seller pays 1*s.*—that is, 2*s.* a head for each cow; that is only for cows of a value of over 10*l.*, but 10*l.* to 8*l.* they charge 2*s.* 6*d.* from the seller, and 2*s.* 6*d.* from the buyer—that is 5*s.* per head. They do not insure any cow under 8*l.* value. The firms work the insurance "scheme" themselves, and they assure me that they find

28 June 1904.]

Mr BAXTER.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

find it just about pays its way. It is self-supporting, and they do not charge anything for working it.

966. Have you noticed that the cattle that are insured fetch higher prices at those two live-stock sales?—Yes, local buyers will not bid for the cattle unless they are insured.

967. And practically all the good beasts put up at the only two live-stock markets are insured, are they?—Yes, that is so; they are all insured, and in a great many cases also the farmer pays the insurance, and the auctioneer or firm of salesmen have no risks because the animal is bought for resale in some other market. The farmer does not grudge paying the 4*d.*, or shilling in the case of a cow, because he gets the local butchers to buy, and he would not get them to buy if he did not pay the insurance.

Sir Mark Stewart.

968. Does this system of insurance give general satisfaction?—Yes, the butchers are very pleased with the arrangement.

969. Is it carried out in any other locality, do you know?—No, I am not acquainted with any other place where it is done. I know how it works so far as Dundee goes, and we know it works well. We keep the hide attached to the bullock for identification purposes, so that the auctioneer may satisfy himself the proper carcase is being paid compensation upon.

970. Does the auctioneer do that?—In the slaughterhouse we keep the hide attached to the bullock, so that it may be identified by the farmer who has sold it in case of any question arising as to identification.

971. The veterinary surgeon, I suppose, is the judge?—Yes, he is the judge as to whether it should be condemned or not.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

972. Would the amounts paid be sufficient to cover the loss if in every case you destroyed the whole of the carcase?—I think not; they would not be sufficient.

973. Are you aware that in other districts it is the practice to destroy the whole of the carcase?—I am not aware of it; we work under the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

974. The opposition of your authority to payment for compensation is based to some extent, is it not, on the fact that the carcasses are going out of your district for food into other places?—To some extent, and again they say that it is a loss that can be insured against.

975. Apart from the question of insurance, would that opposition be mitigated if it were paid out of a national fund, rather than out of a purely local fund?—They have not gone into that matter.

Mr. Field.

976. Do you recognise the utility of a minimum, or do the insurance people recognise the utility of a minimum?—Yes.

977. They do not insure any beast, I understand, under 8*l.*?—That is so.

Mr. Field—continued.

978. Have they any maximum?—No; not that I have heard of.

979. With regard to the 4*d.* from the seller, and 4*d.* from the buyer for an ox, heifer or a bull, when you use the word seller is that money provided by the auctioneer or the farmer?—By the farmer.

980. And the other is provided by the butcher who buys, is it?—Yes.

981. Has that system worked fairly satisfactorily so far?—It has worked for many years.

982. How long has it been in operation?—Six years, at any rate, if not more—perhaps 10 years.

983. And it has been satisfactory to both sides, has it?—Yes.

984. With regard to the objection you have to compensation being paid, by reason of the fact that beasts have to come in from a long distance, and a great deal of them go outside to be sold, if the principle of compensation were admitted would you think it fair that the localities from which the cattle came should bear a portion of the expense?—I think the locality from which the cattle comes should bear any expenses connected with it, because they rear the cattle there.

Dr. Farquharson.

985. Do you mean the farmer?—Yes, he has much greater opportunity of discovering tuberculosis than anybody else.

Mr. Field.

986. Are you aware that several of the prize cattle exhibited at the last Smithfield Show were condemned on account of tuberculosis?—I have not heard that.

987. You may take it from me that is so. Would not that prove the difficulty of diagnosing the disease in a live animal?—Of course.

Mr. Loyd.

988. Has the insurance company, or insurance arrangement you spoke of, any definite name?—No, it is just done by the auctioneers.

989. By the two large selling firms, is that so?—Yes.

Chairman.

990. The only two in Dundee?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

991. What are the names of the auctioneers?—Peter Macintyre, Limited, and Dodds and Bathie.

Mr. Field.

992. Do they sell nearly all the good cattle sold in that district?—They are the only auctioneers in Dundee.

After a short adjournment,

993. Are

28 June 1904.

Professor MATTHEW HAY, M.D., called and examined :

Chairman.

993. Are you medical officer of health for the City of Aberdeen?—I am.

994. For how many years have you been in that office?—For about 16 years.

995. Are you also Professor of Forensic Medicine and Public Health in the University of Aberdeen?—I am.

996. For whom do you appear?—I appear for the Corporation of Aberdeen, and also as a delegate of the conference of various municipal and county authorities held in London on Friday the 17th of this month.

997. Are those authorities, and is also the Council of Aberdeen, opposed to the principle of this Bill?—They are opposed to the Bill.

998. Can you give the Committee any facts with regard to the meat trade of Aberdeen?—The meat trade of Aberdeen is much more extensive than one would suppose from the size of the city. We have no public slaughter-houses in Aberdeen, so that I cannot give you the precise figures of the number of cattle slaughtered; but our meat inspector made an estimate for me before I left, and he thinks that about 45,000 cattle, exclusive of calves, are slaughtered annually in Aberdeen, about 40,000 sheep, and 2,000 pigs.

999. In the public abattoirs?—We have no public abattoirs in Aberdeen, I am sorry to say. We have only private slaughterhouses. One of them is almost a public slaughterhouse—it is owned by the Incorporated Trade of Fleshers.

1000. Are many of the carcasses slaughtered exported from Aberdeen?—Yes.

1001. What proportion is consumed on the spot?—I think not more than one-fifth or one-sixth of the 45,000 cattle are consumed in Aberdeen, the remainder being sent very largely to London.

1002. So that naturally the Corporation of Aberdeen object to paying compensation?—Yes.

1003. On what ground do they object chiefly; on the ground of the increase of rates, is it?—Our first objection is that we believe the proposals of the Bill would be inimical to public health.

1004. Will you tell the Committee in what way?—We believe with the Royal Commissions which have already reported on the matter of tuberculosis, that tuberculosis is communicable from cattle to man. It may not happen very often, but we believe it does happen now and again, and we are anxious to prevent that source of disease as far as possible; and we think it can best be done by not giving compensation, and by leaving upon butchers and, behind them, upon breeders and farmers, the responsibility of eradicating tuberculosis.

1005. Have you any experience as to whether that can be done in herds of cattle?—We have had no experience in the north, but there has been experience elsewhere, partly in this country

Chairman—continued.

and more particularly in Denmark in the way of extirpating tuberculosis from herds, I believe with success where proper methods have been applied.

1006. You cannot speak from personal knowledge, I understand?—I cannot speak from personal knowledge.

1007. Do you think that the Bill might be modified so as to offer only partial compensation?—No, I am against any compensation being paid at all. Of course, a partial compensation would be in our opinion an improvement, but we are altogether against compensation.

1008. Are you afraid of any inducement being given to the butchers to conceal or not to make public any outbreak of tuberculosis?—I do not think that the compensation proposed under the Bill would really lead in any great extent, to more tuberculous cases being discovered than are being discovered and dealt with under the present system.

1009. But if you gave compensation, do you consider that more cases would come to light?—We think not many more cases would come to light, and on the other hand if you gave compensation there would be no inducement as there is at present to produce cattle without tuberculosis.

1010. Do not you think more cases would come up for payment of compensation than are at present known to exist?—As far as Aberdeen is concerned I do not think it probable that the number would be greatly increased. I think we probably know at present practically all the tuberculous cases in Aberdeen under our system of inspection.

1011. Do not you think it would be an encouragement to butchers to come forward and declare they have tuberculous carcasses which they would rather now wish to conceal?—It looks on the face of it as if there would be that encouragement, but that depends on the particular place. Speaking for the moment of Aberdeen, practically all the tuberculous carcasses are declared under our system.

1012. You do not think there is much concealment?—I do not think there is much concealment, unless as to very inferior carcasses which the Bill does not propose to deal with. Really the worst cases would not be dealt with at all.

1013. Then you think, do you, that the cases of tuberculosis in Aberdeen very rarely escape concealment?—I think they very rarely escape concealment, mainly because we have an understanding with the butchers, since we have no public slaughterhouse, that they will inform us of all cases of tuberculosis that they come across. If they inform us frankly of them we deal with the case as a surrendered case, and it does not go before the Court. If they do not inform us, but attempt concealment, then the case must go before the Court and be dealt with by the magistrate.

1014. Are

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

1014. Are there not a good many cases where the butcher cannot possibly discern whether the animal is tuberculous or not?—If the animal is alive, yes, but not in the case of the dead animal.

1015. But in the case of the live animal, does it not come very hard on the butcher to have to buy him in the open market, and then to have him condemned the moment it is sold?—That is simply a risk of his trade, like risks in other trades; it would not be a risk at all if he knew beforehand the animal was diseased.

1016. Have you any figures with regard to the percentage of animals that are found in that condition?—If you take the number of carcasses we seized for tuberculosis in Aberdeen during the last year, I think it amounted to 1 in 600 or 700 amongst oxen and heifers; amongst cows the proportion was distinctly higher—about 1 in 30.

1017. Have you many cows in Aberdeen?—There are comparatively few cows slaughtered in Aberdeen. I believe not above 600 per annum, as against over 40,000 oxen and heifers.

1018. Is that about the average over a number of years?—Yes, that is about the average, but not of seizures. I think the seizures were rather higher, but as far as the number of cattle is concerned that is about the number.

1019. 6,000 or 7,000 fat cows are slaughtered in Aberdeen, are they?—No, they are sold; only about a tenth of them are slaughtered in Aberdeen. They pass into the animal market, and after being bought by butchers or dealers are taken on elsewhere, I believe largely to Newcastle and other towns.

1020. Parliament provides no compensation, does it for such a risk as the butchers incur?—No, there is no compensation in any Act known to me.

1021. Do you hold views as to the possibility of insuring against this risk?—I think all I can venture to say is that insurance is practised against this risk in Aberdeen, and I believe elsewhere.

1022. Will you tell the Committee about the system practised in Aberdeen; is it carried on now by a company?—It is carried on now by a regular insurance company.

1023. By the Horse, Carriage, and General Insurance Company?—Yes.

1024. Can you give the Committee their rates?—At present the exposer, I suppose usually the farmer, pays to the insurance company 1s. for each ox or heifer. The 1s. insures two-thirds of the value of the carcass. The butcher is allowed to insure to the extent of one-sixth part, for which he pays 3d. The one-sixth added to the four-sixths makes five-sixths of the value of the animal, the remaining sixth the insurance company refuses to insure—they leave the loss of this with the butcher. I believe they found when they insured for the whole value, there was a temptation on the part of those engaged in the trade not to be so exact about the value of the animals, and they resolved to leave a certain amount of responsibility with the butcher.

Chairman—continued

1025. Do they insure cows?—They do not insure cows in Aberdeen at present. This is not because of any refusal by the insurance company to insure. They have not discussed the question as to what premium should be paid for them; the premium would be larger.

1026. Can you give the proportion of oxen and heifers that are condemned in Aberdeen?—I have already said that the proportion is about 1 to 600 or 700 of the oxen and heifers.

1027. And cows?—About 1 in 20.

1028. What do you say about the proposition that this is a trade risk. Do you think it falls on the butcher?—If one may judge from the method in Aberdeen it would look as if two-thirds were borne by the exposer or farmer, and the rest of it by the butcher. But my opinion about these risks is that every trade must be carried on at a profit; the cost of these risks eventually falls upon the consumer; that if the farmer is obliged to pay something for insurance the buyer can afford to pay a little more for the animal, and he in turn charges a little more for the carcass when he sells it to consumers. That is done, I take it, so that all the loss falls practically on the consumer.

1029. They pass it on to the consumer or deduct it from the seller?—Yes, but the seller in this case probably covers his loss by getting a somewhat better price for his animal because of its being insured.

1030. What do you think would be the effect of this Bill on the amount of tuberculosis; do you think it would lessen the amount or tend to increase the amount of tuberculosis?—I do not think it would very much affect it one way or the other. It would not tend to diminish it as far as I see, because there would be no inducement for farmers under this Bill to get quit of tuberculosis in their herds, as they would always get full payment for the animal.

1031. As to your method in Aberdeen with regard to animals condemned, you do not often take the butcher before the magistrate I understand?—Very rarely.

1032. Under this Bill, as the compensation is to be awarded by a magistrate, if compensation is to be paid it would be necessary to take all cases before a magistrate, would it not?—That is so; the cases would increase by 30 times their present number.

1033. And would your staff have to be increased?—Yes, it would add to the work of the staff very considerably, because they would have to spend so much of their time in the Courts.

1034. Do you find your butchers anxious not to appear in court?—Yes, at least I assume that is so. I do not think a butcher would care very much about such cases being taken into court, even although he had comparatively few of them.

1035. Do you share the opinion expressed by Glasgow as to the unfairness of charging the compensation on the place of slaughter?—Yes, that would be rather a serious matter, and we think it most unjust.

1036. It has been argued that if the authorities had to pay compensation they would be more careful

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

careful in regard to the carcasses they condemn. Do you think that would be for the public good?—No, if those who favour this Bill mean by it that we would condemn fewer carcasses, it means that we should pass more tubercle than at present; and that cannot be for the public good if tuberculosis is communicable from animals to man.

1037. As to the complaints addressed to this Committee about the excessive amount of meat condemned, what is your practice in Aberdeen; do you follow the recommendations of the Royal Commission?—We follow faithfully the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

1038. As to pigs, how many were slaughtered last year in Aberdeen?—About 2,000.

1039. How many were condemned?—Only two.

1040. Is not that an exceptionally small proportion?—Yes, that does seem an exceptionally small proportion; I have asked the meat inspector about the small number, and he says he did not find any pig during that time showing much tubercle. There may have been a few outside the two showing a small amount of tubercle, but those he did not deal with beyond destroying the parts affected.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1041. Do you know anything about the practice of other local authorities?—To some extent I do.

1042. Does not Aberdeen take a rather more lenient view in this matter than the Corporation of Glasgow in regard to the slaughtering of pigs?—We have never had any comparison made about pigs; we have been blamed for being more severe than other corporations in the matter of cattle, but as regard pigs I have not heard any comparison made.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1043. Did you attend the conference of the municipal authorities?—I did.

1044. Was it unanimous?—It was not.

1045. Was there a minority?—There was a minority.

1046. To what extent?—34 to 8, as far as my recollection goes.

1047. Were you one of the witnesses who were selected by that conference to attend here?—Yes.

1048. Were all the witnesses selected from the majority?—I think so. They were not all appointed at the time by the conference, but I understood they were going to represent the majority.

1049. I assumed as much, but you admit there was a minority at that conference in favour of the Bill?—I am not sure about that; I think there were very few in favour of the Bill as it stands. There were, no doubt, a few in favour of some sort of compensation, but not the compensation as laid down in the Bill.

1050-51. I see from your proof that you send out of your district a large number of animals slaughtered at Aberdeen; is that one reason why you feel the whole burden should not fall on the local authority?

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

—Yes, we are very strong about that in Aberdeen, because four-fifths of the oxen and heifers slaughtered in Aberdeen are sent to London and elsewhere.

1052. And you say this has an important bearing on the opposition to the Bill by the Corporation of Aberdeen?—It has, we do not rear these cattle in the city of Aberdeen, we do not consume them, and we think it most unfair and unjust that we should be asked to pay compensation on such animals of these four-fifths as happen to be suffering from tubercle.

1053. Would that same argument apply if the compensation were awarded out of Imperial funds instead of out of local funds?—So far as that particular argument goes it would largely if not entirely disappear.

1054. Did the conference of Municipal Corporations which appointed you as a witness, recognise the fact that in a private member's Bill it was impossible to throw compensation upon an imperial fund?—I cannot recollect that that was said at the meeting; I do not think it was brought out.

1055. You recognise that fact yourself, I suppose?—If you tell me so I believe it; I am not acquainted with Parliamentary procedure.

1056. I want to put it to you that the source from which compensation may be payable, whether imperial or local, is not one of the vital questions under this Bill. You have a strong objection to its being local on the grounds you stated, I understand?—That is one objection.

1057. Your objection so far as that point is concerned, would be mitigated if it were from an Imperial fund, would it not?—Very much so.

1058. Do you hold the view that the passage of this Bill would do nothing to stamp out tuberculosis?—I do. I think it might possibly encourage it. Perhaps I have put it too strongly; but I certainly think it does nothing towards stamping it out.

1059. You said, "best be done by not giving compensation," did you not?—Yes.

1060. Compensation is not now given, is it?—It is not being given at present.

1061. It is best stamped out by not giving compensation?—Yes.

1062. What is being done to stamp it out now?—The subject is largely a new one. It is only within the last few years that the country has been waking up to the dangers of tuberculosis; indeed, to the fact that it was a communicable disease even amongst men, and we hope before long there will be sufficient public conscience in the matter to lead to efforts being made to stamp it out.

1063. Public conscience is best accelerated by public payment, is it not?—Not necessarily; we think the conscience would be keenest among the parties most immediately concerned; that is to say, amongst the butchers and amongst the farmers. If you spread the responsibility over the whole people they will be indifferent.

1064. If as part of a measure to deal with the subject, it becomes part of the duty of a local authority to notify that animals coming from their

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

their district were diseased, would there be no public gain from such notification?—We should be quite glad to notify the local authorities of districts from which we found tuberculous animals coming, but I do not know that there is any one district more than another from which tuberculous animals come, so far as Aberdeen is concerned.

1065. Do you find the disease spreads equally?—Pretty generally as regards the kind of cattle slaughtered in Aberdeen. At the present time we slaughter no foreign cattle; they are all home-bred cattle; they are either from Scotland or Ireland, and include a few from Orkney and Shetland.

1066. How do you find the Irish cattle compare with Scotch cattle?—I do not think there is much difference. Of course these cattle after being brought to Aberdeenshire are usually fed there for some time, so that one cannot properly compare them with the Aberdeen cattle.

1067. The society you have referred to do not insure cows, I understand?—No, they do not; as I have already said, very few cows are slaughtered in Aberdeen.

1068. Do you know why they do not insure them?—I have asked the insurance company, and they say simply because no proposals have been made. They are quite willing to insure them provided a sufficient premium is paid.

1069. The risk is greater?—The risk is greater undoubtedly.

1070. And the premium paid would have to be higher?—Certainly.

1071. Have you given much attention to this question of trade insurance?—I know, of course, what has been done in Aberdeen; I have not inquired much about what has been done elsewhere.

1072. I presume there would be serious difficulties in your view, in the way of any trade insurance fund, unless the practice with regard to condemnation was similar throughout the whole area?—Do you mean if there was an insurance scheme for the whole kingdom?

1073. I mean if an insurance scheme covered a fairly wide area, it would be essential that the same practice with regard to condemnation should prevail throughout that area, would it not?—It would be desirable, although it does not make an insurance scheme necessarily impossible, because of different practices in different places; the one place can be made to average with the other in any wide insurance scheme.

1074. Some authorities, the Committee have been told, insist on the condemnation of the entire carcass; others will remove the diseased portion when the disease is merely local. The loss which falls upon the butcher is very different in the two cases, is it not?—Yes, it would be somewhat different. It depends, of course, on what is meant by a partial seizure.

1075. Therefore, if it is to be met by a system of trade insurance, it would be desirable that the practice should be uniform throughout the whole area, would it not?—I do not suggest it would not be desirable to have a uniform system

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

in dealing with tuberculosis or in condemning cattle.

1076. Has it ever occurred to you that the granting of compensation to the butcher would remove the stain of criminality which often falls on him under the existing law?—That has not occurred to me I confess. There is no stain at present unless the butcher is taken before a court of law, and we do not do that in Aberdeen unless he is intentionally concealing the carcass. The case is not published in any sort of way in Aberdeen, and there is no stain attaching to him whatever.

1077. I am inclined to think that Scotland adopts a more rational view, but in other districts we have it in evidence that if a carcass be found on premises in a diseased condition, a summons may at once issue, and the onus rests with the butcher to prove that he did not intend to place it on the market. Then, as you will understand, he not only loses the market, but his trade is injured, and I put it to you would not a grant of compensation be practically a certificate of innocence in that case.—I would remedy that difficulty, as we remedy it in Aberdeen, by making it practically incumbent on the butcher when he has a tuberculous carcass to inform the sanitary authorities. He does it there, and inspectors inspect it, and if it is a carcass that should be seized, it is seized by consent; but if a butcher wilfully conceals meat which he sees to be tubercular, and does not tell the authorities about it, and they come and find it in his shop, then even in Aberdeen a man would be taken before the Court. But that does not happen in Aberdeen except very rarely; scarcely once in six months.

Dr. Farquharson.

1078. Do you use your discretion as to what class of cases you send before the magistrates, and what you do not?—Yes.

1079. Who is the magistrate—the Sheriff?—No, in the city it is the Bailie, a member of the City Council.

1080. Not a real legal authority like the Sheriff?—The Bailie is a legal authority, but he has not the legal training of the Sheriff. In the county the cases go before the Sheriff.

1081. He has had no legal training, has he?—Nothing beyond what he gets in the Courts.

1082. Is it not the case that a man who is not legally trained is likely to have a capricious opinion in this kind of case?—I really could not say. Of course, these magistrates have always the assistance of legal assessors if they want it, and in a difficult case they nearly always consult the legal assessor.

1083. You told us, did you not, that it would be a very difficult thing to have a definite standard laid down for the guidance of meat inspectors?—I do not know that I said so. I said I thought I should like to see a fairly uniform practice in dealing with tuberculous carcasses.

1084. No doubt it would be very desirable, but would it be possible to eliminate individual

G

discretion

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued.]

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

discretion in the judgment of those cases, which of course must vary a great deal?—One cannot eliminate individual discretion very well in dealing with anything of that kind.

1085. What class of men are your inspectors in Aberdeen; are they trained men; do they pass through any definite training?—Our inspector of meat at the present time is a man who was brought up in the meat trade himself.

1086. As the butcher may think himself aggrieved by the decision of the inspector, is there any reference to a higher authority; can he go before any higher authority to get his case reconsidered? Has he an appeal as they have in Glasgow?—We never have had an appeal in Aberdeen, but I imagine that the case in Glasgow to which you refer was dealt with under the Public Health Act, and that Act is applicable, of course, to Aberdeen as well as to Glasgow; there is an appeal, certainly, as to some things under that Act, and there may be an appeal in such a case to the higher courts.

1087. Do you think the farmer who breeds the animal and sells it in perfectly good faith ought to bear any portion of the risk?—In a way I would be glad to see the whole risk thrown back upon the farmer. He is the breeder, and he is the man who can get quit of the tubercle in his herds. I do not see why the farmer should not bear his full share of the risk.

1088. I understood that tubercle often occurs in an animal which to outward appearance is perfectly healthy?—That is so.

1089. Does not that rather go against the argument that the farmer should be penalised for selling a beast which he honestly considers to be healthy?—No, I consider that it is one of the risks of his trade, and does not differ from the risks attaching to almost any other trade.

1090. I thought your argument was that the risk should eventually fall on the consumer?—I argued some few minutes ago that no doubt the cost of insurance is at the present time very largely paid by the consumer, owing to an increase in the charge made by the butcher.

1091. The result of that would be, would it not, that the consumer would have to pay a higher price for home meat?—The difference is very little. As I have already said the insurance paid for each ox or heifer in Aberdeen is only altogether about eighteen pence, supposing the whole animal were insured; upon animals costing, say 18*l.* to 20*l.* and 22*l.* a piece, the extra cost per lb. is hardly to be calculated, it is very small.

1092. But the butcher would take care, would he not, that none of that risk fell on him?—I suppose he protects himself by charging his customers more.

1093. Of course none of that extra charge would be put upon foreign meat?—No, not if it is free from tubercle. If foreign meat is brought in dead, I take it that in the slaughter-house where the animals have been slaughtered abroad there is some system of inspection, and probably some elimination of tubercular carcasses also, which will add to the cost of the remaining carcasses when sent on to this country.

1094. Does not that rather place a premium

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

on foreign meat as against home grown meat?—I do not see that it does, if the proportion of tubercular carcasses in foreign meat is practically the same as in our own country; because they would all be seized, and those carcasses which have been passed must bear the loss upon those seized, if the carcasses sent from abroad are free from tubercle.

1095. Do you hold the opinion that tuberculosis is a preventable disease?—Yes.

1096. Your objection, I understand, is not so much to the provisions of the Bill as to the principle which it contains; in other words, you are opposed to the principle of compensation?—We object to both; we object to the principle, and we object very much to its particular form.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1097. Do I understand you to say that foreign meat which comes into this country is free from tubercle?—I do not know, I was simply putting it hypothetically, I have no practical experience of foreign meat; we have no foreign meat brought into Aberdeen.

1098. Do you consider the root of the mischief in home-grown meat arises in the country?—Yes, it arises very largely there; it must arise where the cattle are bred and reared.

1099. So that if the competition between foreign meat and home-grown meat results in favour of foreign meat, it comes to a competition between healthy meat and diseased meat, does it not?—Yes.

1100. And anything which helps to discourage competition between diseased meat and healthy meat is undesirable, is it not?—Clearly.

1101. Do you think compensation would do that?—I think so, in so far as there would be then no inducement to farmers to rear their animals free from tubercle.

1102. Is it not the fact that farmers are handicapped in the rearing of animals by the insanitary conditions under which they have to rear them?—That may very largely be so.

1103. Then it is not the farmer's fault, is it?—Then it is the landlord's fault.

1104. Then we get back to the landlord, do we not?—Yes.

1105. Suppose you make compensation of this description to apply in such a way that the landlord would be forced to reconsider his position, you might get at stamping out tuberculosis in the home-grown product, might you not?—That might be so; of course it is a very difficult economic problem.

Mr. Field.

1106. Could you give the Committee any idea of the number of animals seized for tuberculosis in Aberdeen; what would be the average per hundred?—I have already said that we seize about one carcase in 700 of oxen and heifers, and I distinguish between those and cows, because the proportion in cows is higher—about 1 in 20.

1107. Is it a fact the average seizure in Aberdeen amounts to something like one animal per day?—Oh, no. The number last year for all

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

all animals would be about 100, I think. That would be one every three or four days roughly.

1108. Did I understand you to say that the 1s. insurance premium covers only heifers and oxen?—That is so.

1109. What is the reason there are so few cows in Aberdeen?—There are a considerable number of fat cows, some 6,000 or 7,000 sold in Aberdeen, but nine-tenths after being sold are transported and killed elsewhere.

1110. As a rule what is called the Aberdeen beef which comes to London is ox beef of the best quality, is it not?—Yes.

1111. And in that class of beef you have cases of tuberculosis, have you not?—Yes, as I say to the extent of about 1 carcase in 600 or 700.

1112. So that you would not agree, I understand, with some of the witnesses, that tuberculosis is mainly if not altogether confined to cows?—It is much more largely met with in cows than in oxen or heifers, and of course cows being killed at a greater age, it is much more advanced at the time they are killed. These oxen and heifers killed in Aberdeen average about two years of age.

1113. Do I understand that the insurance covers five-sixths of the live value of the animals?—Yes, that is so.

1114. Not of the carcase?—Not of the carcase.

1115. How long has this insurance company been running?—I am not quite certain.

1116. About how long?—I may say that an insurance system has been practised in Aberdeen for 17 to 18 years. At first the salesmen themselves conducted the insurance and paid for any loss. Then later on it was taken up by an insurance company. I think they have been going on for at any rate 6 or 8 years, but I am not quite certain how long.

1117. Your system of inspecting pigs appears not to be so rigid as it is in other places, I understand?—It is either that, or the pigs are better in Aberdeen than elsewhere.

1118. That may be true, but I think if you sent them to London you would probably find out they would not have much more respect for the Aberdeen pig than any other. It depends a good deal on the standard the Inspector takes unto himself, does it not?—We have a very high standard. We have not one standard for pigs and another for cattle; we apply the same standard to all practically.

1119. Would you think it fair, if this Compensation Bill is passed, that the local authorities from whose districts the cattle come should pay a certain amount. I understand you have a strong objection to an urban district paying the total amount of compensation, and you think the districts which rear the cattle should assist in the payment of compensation?—That wants consideration. I think they have more reason to pay it than a municipality like Aberdeen, where we do not grow the cattle and where we consume only a fraction of the carcasses.

1120. Does it not strike you that if the Corporation are prosecuting, and a bailie is the

Mr. Field—continued.

magistrate, that the Corporation occupies the dual position of judge and prosecutor?—That fact has been remarked upon with regard to various kinds of cases that come before our magistrates in Scotland, but I do not think any abuse results from it.

1121. Have you had any practical experience of this inspection yourself?—Yes, I see all disputed cases myself; all cases that are at all likely to go before the court I invariably see myself.

1122. How long has this question of compensation been before the Corporation?—We have never had the question of compensation raised before the Corporation until this Bill was brought before Parliament.

1123. Did your local authority ever consider how the matter is dealt with in regard to swine and swine fever?—In the case of swine fever and pleuro-pneumonia, where I believe compensation is paid, the case is different, in my opinion, from compensation for tuberculous cattle. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia you are dealing with a disease which happens comparatively rarely, and which when it occurs one is exceedingly anxious to stamp out, and one can succeed in stamping it out by certain drastic measures. In the case of tuberculosis, what you propose to do in the way of compensation will not stamp it out at all; it is a pure compensation process, without any reference whatever to stamping out the disease; on the contrary, it would probably rather tend to encourage it than to stamp it out.

1124. Would you be surprised to hear a great many people hold an entirely different view from you, and that the fact of compensating a man, instead of leading him to endeavour to conceal the disease, would lead him to stamp out the disease, that they would be encouraged to use the tuberculin test?—Of course, in the case of milch cows in byres some advantage would be gained by applying the tuberculin test; but whether that should be coupled with compensation or not seems to me a different question from the one we are discussing.

Mr. Loyd.

1125. Might it be said that the butchers are suffering from a little extra caution on the part of the public at the present time?—In some places that may be so. I admit that some feel not quite clear, having regard to the great difference of opinion that does exist, as to whether tuberculosis in cattle may be so dangerous to man as others imagine.

1126. At any rate, very naturally the local authority likes to be on the safe side, does it not?—As we are with regard to all public health matters, because we act not merely upon injury, but where we believe there is danger to health. Constantly, under every part of the Public Health Act, we are taking measures every day to prevent danger to health, and not waiting for actual injury.

1127. Supposing the dealer and the customer alone were dealing with the commodity, is it very likely in your opinion that a great deal of meat would pass as between the seller and the

buyer

28 June 1904.]

Professor HAY, M.D.

[Continued]

Mr. Loyd—continued.

buyer which would be stopped from so passing by the local authority?—I do not think any buyer would take tuberculous meat knowingly.

1128. But do you think a certain amount of meat which to all appearances was good would be cut away by the local authority, which, as between the buyer and the seller, would be regarded as perfectly sound?—Do you mean under the present system, or what system?

1129. Under the present system. To be on the safe side do not you condemn large portions of animals, because you think it is safer?—No, we only condemn animals where we believe there is tuberculosis disseminated more or less throughout the carcase. In the case of these higher class cattle it is in the dressed carcase very largely confined to the glands; but some of these glands are embedded deep down in the muscles of the animals, and it would be difficult to clear them out without mutilating the carcase to such an extent as to make it unsaleable as a high class carcase.

1130. Do you think the butchers are to some extent, in the present state of science, suffering for the benefit of the community?—I

Mr. Loyd—continued.

do not think they are really, because this is a risk which is an admitted risk; and I take it they protect themselves against the risk by simply charging the consumer something more, as in any other trade where there are risks.

Captain Ellice.

1131. Do you notice any difference in the amount of tuberculous cattle in different seasons of the year?—No.

1132. Is there no difference, whether the cattle are fattened on grass or in byres?—I do not think we have noticed much difference in Aberdeen, but I have not specially inquired into the effect of season.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1133. You are an official of your local authority, are you not?—I am the Medical Officer of Health to the local authority.

1134. Has the local authority discussed and considered this subject since the second reading of this Bill?—Yes. It was after the second reading of the Bill that they resolved to oppose it actively.

Mr. SHIRLEY MURPHY, called and Examined.

Chairman.

1135. Are you the Medical Officer of Health for the County of London?—I am.

1136. Have you held that position for 15 years?—That is so.

1137. Were you also a member of the Royal Commission which we have called here Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission on tuberculosis?—That is so.

1138. I understand the County Council of London is opposed to this Bill?—That is so.

1139. Did they summon a conference on the subject on the 17th June?—They did.

1140. Was it a conference of County Councils and County Boroughs?—Yes.

1141. Were all the County Councils and all County Boroughs in England and Scotland invited to attend?—They were.

1142. How many did attend?—There were, I think, 32.

1143. Was the County of Lanarkshire invited amongst others?—They were invited undoubtedly.

1144. Was the City of Edinburgh invited?—Glasgow invited the Scotch representatives to attend the meeting at the County Hall in Spring Gardens, so that I have not a list of those whom they invited.

1145. At any rate, either directly or indirectly all the Counties and County Boroughs in England and Scotland were invited to attend?—That was so.

Mr. Field.

1146. Was any County Council invited from Ireland?—No, it was confined to England and Scotland only.

Chairman.

1147. Will you read to the Committee the first resolution you came to with regard to principle. Was this it: "Resolved, that in the opinion of this conference the principle of compensation as embodied in the Tuberculous (Animals) Compensation Bill, 1904, is contrary to sound public policy"?—That is so.

1148. Was that resolution carried unanimously?—No, there were 34 votes in favour of it to 8 against.

1149. I thought you had only 32 authorities represented?—There was more than one representative for each authority in some cases.

1150. So that you are giving the actual votes, are you?—Yes; the number of persons who held up their hands in favour of or against the resolution.

1151. Did you take down the names of the authorities represented by those eight dissentients?—No, they were not taken down.

1152. Do you hand in a copy of all the resolutions and a transcript of the shorthand writer's notes of the proceedings?—Yes. (*The same were handed in.*)

1153. Can you tell the Committee where the opposition came from?—I do not think I can tell you which were the objecting authorities; it might perhaps be ascertained from the notes.

1154. As regards the Bill, you oppose it, I understand, on the ground partly that there is no precedent for such legislation?—That is so.

the

28 June 1904.]

Mr. MURPHY.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

the Public Health law has never in regard to seizure of unwholesome food recognised the principle of compensating the person whose food is seized.

1155. Will you refer the Committee to the Acts under which diseased and unsound meat is seized?—Section 47 of the Public Health (London) Act as to London, and as to the rest of the country Section 116 of the Public Health Act, 1875.

1156. In those two Acts is there no mention of compensation at all?—None whatever.

1157. So that this is a proposal made, I understand, to amend the law in one instance of condemnation for one particular disease only?—That is so.

1158. Do you say that this Bill is framed on the Minority Report of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission?—Yes, it seems to follow the lines of that Report.

1159. Do you agree as to the risk being met properly by warrant and insurance?—Yes, quite.

1160. What do you say about the precedent of the Contagious Diseases Animals Acts?—Compensation of course is given under those Acts, but those Acts relate to the stamping out of disease, while the proposal in this Bill has no relation whatever to the stamping out of disease; it is merely a question of compensation to a man who has the misfortune to buy for the purpose of slaughter an animal that is tuberculous.

1161. Have you something to say as to the actual provisions of the Bill?—Yes.

1162. Do you agree with the other witnesses as to the unfairness of the system proposed in the Bill on raising the money for compensation from the place of slaughter?—Quite so.

1163. Do you also consider there would be some difficulty about the identification of the animal?—I think that would be so with regard to animals that are killed in one part of the country and sent to another where the carcase might be seized.

1164. Do you think it would be impossible to say that the carcase seized was the carcase of an animal bought, we will say, in Devonshire?—I think it would be practically impossible; indeed, I may say that carcasses would practically lose their identity in many large slaughterhouses.

1165. Do you think there would be some advantage in a Bill in the direction of encouraging butchers to call attention to diseased meat in their possession?—I think it might possibly operate somewhat in that direction.

1166. You, of course, are in favour of compensation being paid out of the Imperial Exchequer, speaking on behalf of the County Council?—The County Council is very undesirous of paying it itself, but the County Council's opposition extends to compensation of any sort.

1167. The London County Council are in a somewhat peculiar position, are they not, in the fact that they are not the authority who administer the Public Health Act in the matter of the seizure of carcasses?—That is so; they have no control over the action of the officers who are concerned in the inspection of meat.

Chairman—continued.

1168. Though under the Bill the County Council would pay the compensation, they are not the authority which would seize the meat, are they?—That is so.

1169. In fact you have no power, have you, even to compel the Borough Councils who are the authorities, and the City Corporation, to furnish you with any returns as to the amount of meat they seize?—No, the Council has certain relations with those authorities under the Public Health Act, but they do not extend to determining what standard shall be adopted in dealing with meat as tuberculous.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1170. I notice that you say the London County Council opposition extends to compensation of any sort, but has not the London County Council just accepted the second reading of a Bill in the House of Commons in which they undertake to give compensation in the matter of cows slaughtered on account of the presence of tuberculosis?—The County Council's Bill provided that a cow with a tuberculous udder, or suspected to have a tuberculous udder, should be seized by the Council's officers, that it should be killed, and that if on post-mortem examination it was found that an error had been made in the diagnosis, the owners should receive compensation to the extent of the full value of the animal during its lifetime. The Bill further provided that if the animal was found after death to be suffering from tuberculous disease of the udder, then the owner should only have the value of the carcase. In the passage of the Bill through the Committee of the House of Commons the Committee amended the clause so as to provide compensation for the owner of the diseased animal to the extent of three-quarters of its value during lifetime. That Bill has come back to the County Council in that form, but the Council has not yet had an opportunity of expressing any opinion upon the clause as amended.

1171. But it does now enshrine the principle of compensation, does it not?—It does now include the principle of compensation to the extent of three-quarters of the value of the diseased animal.

1172. Do I understand you to say that is with the sanction of a Committee of this House?—It was as amended by a Committee of this House.

1173. I notice in the earlier portion of your evidence you referred to the compensation as embodied in this Bill, did you not?—Yes, that was in the resolution passed at the Conference.

1174. Assuming that compensation had been provided to be paid from Imperial funds instead of from local funds, would there be, in your view, the same opposition to this Bill?—That I could not say. I can only present to the Committee the words of the Resolution as passed. If the motion had been of a different sort, what the voting would have been I cannot say.

1175. I will take your own personal opinion, if you please, on the subject?—I do not think I could express an opinion about it; I do not think

28 June 1904]

Mr. MURPHY.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

think I know enough of the views of those who were present to say which way they would have voted.

1176. In your judgment then, do I understand the paying of compensation by a local authority would not induce that local authority to make greater efforts to stamp out tuberculosis?—I do not know how it would operate.

1177. Would not it give the local authority a direct public interest arising from the financial burden, and in order to avoid that financial burden would not they be tempted to take strong measures to stamp out the disease?—Whether they would do so or not I cannot say. It might conceivably operate in that direction, but it is not clear to me that it would do so.

1178. Do you think there is any possible advantage from a system which would induce the local authority which has had to condemn the carcase notifying the district from which the animal came that disease existed there. I understand you condemn a carcase which is unsound, and that process is repeated in several cases as to carcases coming from the same district. Would there be any public advantage if you could notify that district from which the carcases came that disease existed there?—I think it would be a good thing to do.

Chairman.

1179. Is there anything to stop you doing it now?—Nothing at all.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1180. But do you do it?—I cannot answer the question as to what is done in London, because the authority I serve is not concerned in the inspection of meat.

Mr. Field.

1181. Had you anything to do with the calling of this conference?—No, I had nothing to do with it. It originated in the first instance from the Glasgow Corporation desiring to have a meeting.

1182. Have you any idea what was the reason that Ireland was not asked to join in that conference, considering she has more at stake on this question than anybody else?—I do not know. As a matter of fact the Glasgow Corporation approached the London County Council with a view to a conference being convened, and then it was arranged that Glasgow should call the Scottish and the London County Council should call the English representatives together.

1183. Can you tell me how many delegates were present at the conference from London?—There were only members of the London County Council present.

1184. How many London men were there who voted in the majority of 34?—The only authorities represented were the London County Council, the County Councils and County Boroughs.

1185. How many delegates were present from the London County Council?—The London County Council members I think did not vote.

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

1186. How many were there present from Glasgow?—Five.

1187. You are aware, of course, that compensation is paid in the case of swine fever and anthrax. Is there any reason why tuberculosis should not be treated in the same way?—The compensation that is given under the Contagious Diseases Animals Act relates to the stamping out of the disease; the proposal in this Bill is entirely different.

1188. I quite agree, but could not it be utilised in that direction in the same way. If we apply the machinery in the Bill which has been got by the London County Council to this proposal, would not that be satisfactory?—You see the position is a different one. The London County Council's Bill deals with it as disease of the udder, which renders the milk absolutely unfit for food. In the case of many tuberculous animals the flesh is not unfit for food, and it would be a very large question to seize all animals that responded to tuberculin.

1189. There are degrees in that as in everything else. Do you think it all right as long as the butcher is left to pay, that things might go on as they are; it does not matter about the butcher being robbed and having to pay, providing the rates are not called upon. Is that your view?—I do not wish to see the butcher or anybody else robbed. The butcher I presume in fixing the price of his meat knows how much it is necessary to charge for the purpose of carrying on a remunerative business.

1190. He certainly does not purchase meat with the object of having the carcase condemned?—But he knows that is one of the risks he has to face.

1191. That depends, does it not, very much on the kind of man the meat inspector is. Are you acquainted with the London practice in regard to the confiscation of pigs at the present time?—No, I am not.

1192. Have you nothing to do with it?—I have nothing to do with it.

1193. Are you here simply as an opponent to any kind of compensation to members of the trade?—Yes, the London County Council objects to this Bill.

Captain Jessel.

1194. What was the conference called for—to consider this Bill?—Yes.

1195. In London is the County Council the authority to deal with the seizure of meat?—No, but under this Bill they would have to pay for it.

1196. Why did you not call in some of the authorities as well, as it was a matter of dealing with meat. How is it none of the authorities that deal with seizures were summoned to the conference to express their views?—Because the bodies who would be affected by this Bill are the bodies who would have to pay, and they are all County Councils or County Boroughs.

1197. After all, the bodies who seize the meat in London are the Borough Councils, are they not?—Yes.

1198. Would

28 June 1904.]

Mr. MURPHY.

[Continued.]

Captain Jessel—continued.

1198. Would they not have to pay?—No, under the Bill the total cost would fall on the London County Council.

1199. The cost in the first instance is met by the borough, is it not, from the rates?—The boroughs only collect the rates, but the County Council would have to pay.

1200. It only happens because you get the rates in bulk, does it not; the borough find the money, do they not?—It will have to come out of the county rate.

1201. But the county rate is provided by the borough, is it not?—That is to say, they collect the rate.

1202. As regards the County Council Bill which is before the House dealing with the question of paying compensation for tuberculous cows, what stage has that got to?—It has been amended in Committee, and, I think, comes before the House to-morrow on third reading.

1203. Has it passed through the House of Lords?—No, not yet.

1204. Is that Bill promoted by the County Council in their capacity as the authorities for enforcing rates with regard to dairies?—Yes, they are the authority for administering the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Order.

1205. Has the London County Council considered the question of paying compensation out of an imperial fund?—The Council has had the

Captain Jessel—continued.

Bill before it, and has objected to the principle of compensation altogether.

1206. Has it considered what the difference would be to London if the cost was borne by the ratepayers or by an Imperial fund?—I do not think that point has been considered.

1207. Have you any idea what the view of the Council is?—I could not give an idea.

1208. You must have considered it in regard to other matters, must you not?—Personally, I have not.

1209. Then you are not able to give any answer to that question?—No.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1210. Will you tell me what length of notice was given in the invitation to this meeting?—I know it was a very short one, because there was very little time to arrange it; it was something like 4 days.

1211. Is it a fact that some of the authorities had the notice on the very day that the meeting was held?—That I could not say. I think they all had 4 days' notice.

1212. Was it stated by several of the delegates attending that meeting that they could not possibly express the opinion of their authorities, as there had been no chance for them to consider the subject; and that they were giving their own personal opinions simply?—I think that was said in a particular case.

Thursday, 30th June 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Kilbride.

Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling Maxwell.
Sir Mark Stewart.
Mr. Austin Taylor.

MR. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ANDREW BEVERIDGE, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1213. Are you the Parliamentary agent for the Corporation of Edinburgh?—That is so.

1214. Do you desire to hand in to the Committee some statistics which have been prepared in Edinburgh on the subject of tuberculosis and

Chairman—continued.

as to animals slaughtered in Edinburgh?—Yes, it is a report by Dr. Williamson, chief sanitary inspector of the City of Edinburgh. (*The report was handed in, vide Appendix.*)

Dr. EDWARD WILLIAM HOPE, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1215. You are the Medical Officer of Health for Liverpool, are you not?—Yes.

1216. Have you seen the questions which the Committee are considering, the first of which is: "Is the loss by seizure a serious one as a whole"?—Yes.

1217. Can you tell us how many carcases of beasts were destroyed in Liverpool during the last five years?—There were 536 carcases of beasts destroyed, which represents 4 per cent. of the bovine animals slaughtered in Liverpool.

1218. Do you mean destroyed wholly or partly?—Wholly destroyed.

1219. Can you give the Committee the number that were partially destroyed?—No, I am not able to give you that information. The viscera in a variety of cases would be destroyed, or parts of the animal would be destroyed.

1220. As to pigs how many have been destroyed within the last 5 years?—115.

1221. What percentage is that of the pigs slaughtered in Liverpool?—A very small fraction indeed; 03.

1222. As to the prosecutions: in how many cases did you prosecute?—In 10 cases only were police proceedings taken.

1223. Although there were something like 650 carcases destroyed, you only prosecuted in 10 cases?—That is so, the remainder were dealt with under the local Act; the carcases were seen by a jury of the trade and destroyed without a magistrate's order.

1224. What is your rule as to taking the butcher into court; have you any rule laid down as to that?—Yes, we follow precisely the Public Health Act provisions which define very clearly

Chairman—continued.

the circumstances under which a prosecution would ensue.

1225. Will you tell us what those circumstances are?—The carcase must have been deposited for the purpose of sale or for preparation for the purpose of sale and intended for the food of man and the onus of proving that it was not so intended or was not deposited with the objects I have stated rests with the party charged.

1226. The offence is knowingly having it on his premises for the food of man is it?—Quite so. The remainder as I say are dealt with under an old local Act and there is no need under those circumstances to take the case before a magistrate at all.

1227. As to the question of the loss caused by the seizure of these cattle do you think it ought to fall on the public partly or entirely?—I think that the loss should fall entirely upon the owner; under the existing law it must be so.

Dr. Farquharson.

1228. Do you mean by the owner, the farmer?—Not necessarily the farmer, unless he is selling it on commission. The farmer may or may not be the original owner; the original owner may be a cow-keeper.

Chairman.

1229. Do you see any objection to the system of insurance which prevails in some cases?—No, I see what objections have been urged, namely, that those who are prudent and careful would have to pay for those who are careless, and through whose carelessness loss arises. That is an objection which might be urged to a system of insurance.

1230. You

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

1230. You condemn other things beside meat, do you not, as unfit for human food?—Quite so.

1231. Do you draw any distinction between meat condemned and other things condemned, such as eggs or nuts?—No, the circumstances are precisely the same, and I would like to quote one or two illustrations. An importer of a very large number of barrels of oysters met with a loss of, perhaps, 1,000%, owing to the fact that the oysters became frosted; there were no means of seeing that they were damaged until they were put on the market, but the loss was his. Again, a large contractor who is bringing into the City, perhaps, some thousands of gallons of milk, is not compensated if that milk is found to be tuberculous.

1232. Though the milk is destroyed?—Though the milk is destroyed and rigorous proceedings would be taken as far as could be done against those sending it. There is nothing to the naked eye, to show that that milk is contaminated, similarly with cargoes of nuts or quantities of eggs imported. It is more difficult to tell whether those articles are unfit for food than it would be to tell whether an animal was tuberculous or not.

1233. Assuming that compensation is given do you share the view of other municipal witnesses, that it ought to come from Imperial funds?—I do not quite share that view, because I fear that anything which removed the responsibility of keeping animals in a healthy condition, would tend to cause tuberculosis. It would render the owners more careless than many of them are now and the public would suffer in consequence.

1234. My point was assuming it is given, you are against compensation being given out of local funds, are you not, on the ground, that the distributing centres ought not to pay for the remissness of the breeding centres?—Quite so, but if it fell upon the breeding centres, it might, perhaps, have the effect of stimulating them to greater efforts in the way of inspection than now.

1235. As to the security required with regard to public funds, out of which compensation might be given, would it be possible to get evidence of the good condition of any carcass from any independent party?—Many cases would arise when that would be quite impossible. The carcass would be seized after it had been dressed, the animal would not have been seen alive by any officer of the body seizing it—the Corporation or Council whoever it might be—and the evidence as to the appearance of the animal could only come of course from those who saw it during life, and whose standard of comparison might not be a high one.

1236. Do you think the granting of compensation would not lead to the reduction of tuberculosis, but rather tend the other way?—Very much the other way.

1237. Can you give the Committee any illustration as to that from the working of your local Act with regard to milk?—Yes, some ten or a dozen years ago the cowsheds in Liverpool were not what they ought to be, and tuberculosis was not uncommon. These matters were attended to; powers were obtained to enable the authority

0.16.

Chairman—continued.

to put the cowsheds in Liverpool in fairly good order as regards ventilation, lighting, and so on, with the results that the cows in those cowsheds are now remarkably free from tuberculosis. But the milk supply of Liverpool is obtained as to one-half from these cows, and the other half from country districts. It was found that the tuberculous milk was coming in from the country districts, and further powers were then sought to enable the Corporation to deal with insanitary cowsheds, milk from which was sent into the city of Liverpool. Amongst other things these powers authorised an inspection of the country cowsheds, and it was very conclusively shown, and is proved to this day by these inspections, that the conditions of those cowsheds now are worse really than anything that was to be met with in Liverpool ten or a dozen years ago.

1238. As bearing on this inquiry, is your point that the loss that your regulations inflict on the cowkeepers compel them to keep their premises in a better state?—Quite so, and that they now fully realise the advantage and the great gain it has been to them; but the difficulty is with the country cowkeeper. If he finds that his insanitary cow sheds, his tuberculosis manufactories, so to speak, are doing him no harm, and that he is compensated if an animal is diseased, it would remove any obligation from him; it would remove the stimulus he otherwise would have had, and has up to a point to keep his cow sheds in a sanitary condition.

1239. You will perhaps notice it has been argued here that if compensation were given, the man who owned a beast would have less temptation to conceal the fact and try to foist the meat on the market, what do you say to that?—I was very much surprised to see any such argument advanced. The trade of the butcher I have always regarded as an honest trade and I think that butchers, like any other people, would not hold the public at ransom, so to speak, and say, If you do not compensate me I will do what I can to run the gauntlet with this diseased carcass. That has not been my experience of them, though they themselves advance the suggestion.

1240. You make some reference in your proof to a local Act of 1842; what does that Act deal with?—That Act deals with carcasses of animals which are unfit for human food. It is a most valuable Act, and notwithstanding that it is of such an old date the phraseology of it has been adopted in the Public Health Act relating to these matters.

1241. It gives no power to compensate, does it?—No; it gives power to take away and seize and destroy meat which is exposed for sale and it also provides for dealing with questions of doubt by a jury of the trade. Those at that time were the only competent authorities to which appeal could be made, and this system we still follow out, not now in cases of doubt, but in cases in which it is thought desirable that there should be a consensus of opinion as to the condition of the carcass.

1242. Do they sit in camera?—No, in the open slaughterhouse. The object really, I take to be, that the owner shall not afterwards say,
H
“The

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

"The inspector took away my carcase and prosecuted me, but he did not prosecute someone else," or "he took away the carcase wrongfully."

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1243. Do you know whether a County Council enjoys any power of compulsory inspection of cowsheds and breeding places?—The City Council of Liverpool has the right to inspect cowsheds if the milk is being sent from those cowsheds into Liverpool, and if there is reason to suspect that tuberculosis may be caused by the consumption of that milk.

1244. That is under a City Act, I believe, is it not?—Yes.

1245. Outside that Special Act what are the powers, do you happen to know, of the County Council of Lancashire?—I do not think the County Council of Lancashire has powers of the same kind. No doubt it has powers to inspect cowsheds just as the Cheshire County Council or any other County Council has; but our difficulty has been that these powers are not put into execution.

Chairman.

1246. Do you mean in the Rural districts?—The Rural districts.

1247. You are aware, are you not, that it is the Rural or Urban District Councils which inspect cowsheds?—It would be, no doubt, the Rural or Urban District Councils. Our practice in any case in which we find it necessary to prohibit the sale of milk within the City of Liverpool is to notify the Rural District Council and the County Council.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1248. You apparently suggest that these rural authorities are somewhat remiss in the matter of inspection, I understand?—Yes.

1249. If they were penalised or had to pay compensation, do you suggest that that would lead to greater effort on their point?—The point, unfortunately, is this: It is not they who would be penalised by this Bill, it is the district where the animals are slaughtered that would be penalised; the animals would be sent from these places into the towns and the towns would have to pay.

1250. But assuming compensation was paid from Imperial funds rather than local funds, it would fall upon them as well, would it not?—I do not see how that could be; it would only fall upon them to such a small extent that it would be no appreciable stimulus to make them inspect the cowsheds.

1251. Some of the witnesses were of opinion that cattle could be traced back. Do you agree?—There would be many difficulties in tracing them back. For example, if a farmer sells a milk cow to a cowkeeper, the cowkeeper in turn keeps it for a length of time, and ultimately its destination is the slaughter-house, or it may be bought in the open market and it would be quite impossible to trace it.

1252. Then apparently, according to you, the people who have had a cow or bullock in their keeping have had some chance of ascertaining that it is in either a tuberculous condition or

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

very probably is so, should be allowed to send it into the market, palm it off on some butcher who has no means of ascertaining whether it is diseased, and when the animal is slaughtered the whole of the loss should fall upon the butcher as a trade risk, and the breeder and cowkeeper should escape scot free. The butcher as a rule is a more intelligent man than the cowkeeper. He has a larger number of animals passing through his hands, he knows more about the business, and he can protect himself. At the same time I should be far from acquitting the cowkeeper who keeps his cows under the insanitary conditions that we too often find them in.

1253. I was going to say that it is a remarkable suggestion that ignorance should escape and technical skill should be penalised? Technical skill would protect the possessor, and the butcher as a rule has more technical knowledge than the cowkeeper. I am, of course, only speaking from my own experience.

1254. You said you feared there would be no chance of ascertaining whether or not an animal was in a sound condition or appeared to be in a sound condition at the time of slaughter. What signs would an animal exhibit if suffering from tuberculosis?—Wasting is one and general ill-health.

1255. After slaughter it is possible to tell whether the animal was in wasting condition when alive or not, is it not?—Yes.

1256. It is possible to judge, is it not, from the character of the skin or the hide what condition the animal was in?—No, I do not think the hide would afford you much guide in telling what the condition of the animal was—it might or it might not, but probably it would not.

1257. Is it not the practice in some districts to keep the hide attached to the carcase until all question of dispute has been set at rest?—I do not know of any. In dressing animals, calves for example, it is the common practice to leave the hides on, but not with the objects of setting disputes at rest. That question does not arise, you see, under the Public Health Act.

1258. No, but it arises under the Bills. The Bill suggests that in every case in which compensation is claimed, the person so claiming compensation shall satisfy the magistrate that the animal was in a good condition or apparently in a good condition when purchased. You have already stated that in your opinion, no satisfactory proof can be given I understand?—I have hardly stated that; I think my answer would hardly bear that interpretation.

1259. It would be difficult then, but not impossible, would it?—It might or might not be difficult; a good deal would depend on circumstances. Then the terms "well-nourished" and "of good appearance" are very vague relative terms, and would be open to a very wide and varied construction. A Guernsey cow for example, a very thin looking animal, may be in a very good condition, but it is very different in appearance to a bullock fattened for slaughter. They are both good and neither may present any appearance of anything wrong to the naked eye.

1260. Can

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

1260. Can you tell the Committee anything more about the 536 bovine carcasses which you say were diseased, were they mostly carcasses of cows or of bullocks?—Mostly cows and no doubt mostly from the cowsheds in or round Liverpool; probably from cowsheds in the vicinity.

1261. So that the result of any legislation, you hope would be that those kinds of animals would be no longer used as food, or there would be a tendency not to use them?—These animals, no doubt, are sent in with the object simply of slaughtering them, they were animals which must be disposed of somehow, and the owners probably had no intention of selling them for food, and were perfectly well aware that they were unfit for food, but simply sent them to a slaughter house to be slaughtered and the carcasses taken away to be boiled for what fat is on them, or to make manure, and so on.

1262. Do you think this Bill would encourage the sale of that type of animal?—Yes, it would encourage the sale, and would discourage the attempts to rid the country of tuberculosis. After all the breeding places of the disease are the close and confined cowsheds. With cows, as with men, as everybody knows in these days, it is rebreathing the foul air which is the main cause of tuberculosis. You do not find it in the animals which are in the open to any great extent.

Dr. Farquharson.

1263. Have you public slaughterhouses in Liverpool?—Yes, we have central abattoirs, and we also have 28 private slaughterhouses.

1264. Are they well conducted on the whole, do you think?—Yes, they are well conducted on the whole. The central abattoir is the place to which we encourage meat to be sent, and which we encourage butchers to use.

1265. Do you think tuberculosis is encouraged by bad sanitation in byres and houses?—Yes, I am sure of it.

1266. Then would it not be a little hard to make the farmer responsible for housing which ought to be looked after by the local authority or provided by the landlord?—That is a matter between the landlord and the tenant. We, of course, as sanitary authorities, are endeavouring to protect the consumers, and we are bringing all the inducements we can to bear upon owner and tenant to agree to the very small requirements necessary to sanitise these places.

1267. All that you can do is to recommend, is it not; you cannot compel the reconstruction of byres in any way can you?—We have power in the City of Liverpool to compel the reconstruction or improvement of cowsheds. Outside the city we have no control over these places except that we can prohibit the people sending milk into Liverpool at all.

1268. Do you condemn an entire animal if it has tuberculosis in a gland or organ?—No, we do not condemn an entire carcass if the lesion is limited, and never have done.

1269. You said just now did you not that one of the symptoms of tuberculosis was that the animal was in ill-health?—Yes.

1270. Do you think under those conditions the animal is fit for human food?—That would

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

depend entirely upon the condition of the carcass after slaughter. An animal's ill health may be of a transient kind. It is obvious that an animal is not well if it will not take its food, it may be that it is a trifling ailment, but it may be that it is a more serious one. These questions are of course outside tuberculosis, because there are a great many diseases of animals difficult to ascertain besides tuberculosis.

1271. Tuberculosis surely must be a disease which greatly affects the general health of an animal. In the case I put would the meat of a tuberculous animal be equally good as that of an animal which was not tuberculous?—In an early stage and with a limited injury or lesion, an ailment perhaps of a gland in the lung, the carcass in all probability would be fit for food.

1272. We have had a good deal of evidence about the desirability of having a specific standard for the examination of animals. Would that be in your view fairly practicable?—If the system of inspection in the country and the Acts which govern that system of inspection were all altered and modified to meet it, it could be done. But we could not do it with the Public Health Act as it stands, because that Act imposes obligations and makes the inspector not a person to advise the butcher, it makes him rather a detective to seize what is unsound.

1273. Do you think that there is anything in the obligation that butchers are suffering from the action of officious inspectors?—We have never had a complaint, and I was astonished to read the evidence, which seemed to suggest that we were so strict that trade had been driven away and we were thrown on the mercy of foreign importers, and so on. As a matter of fact the seizures are fractional. The butchers as a class deal in a good class of beef, very largely foreign, no doubt, but there are the facts; it is no question of driving trade away or driving butchers out of the trade and so forth; and it seems to me that it was entirely on a misapprehension that those statements were made.

1274. You have said that there would be danger of encouraging under a system of compensating butchers to buy an inferior class of meat which they knew to be in a diseased condition?—I think there would be that danger.

1275. That of course, would be only among the smaller and inferior class of butcher, would it not?—They would be indifferent; they would have nothing to lose; and even if proceedings were taken against them, the amount given in compensation would exceed the amount of any penalty for the offence of endeavouring to fust diseased meat upon the public.

1276. But that indicates rather a low condition of morality upon the part of the butcher, does it not?—Quite so; but I should never suggest such a thing.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1277. What are the points in connection with rural cowsheds to which you think special attention should be called?—The condition of the lighting the ventilation, cleanliness, the grooming and care of the cows, the cleanliness of utensils, in fact everything pertaining to the sanitation of the cowsheds.

H 2

1278. Have

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin Taylor—continued.

1278. Have all those points been rectified in the Liverpool cowsheds by your action?—Yes, by the action of the Health Committee.

1279. Had you any difficulty in getting it put right?—At first, yes.

1280. How long ago did you commence?—About a dozen years, I should think, and at first objections were raised. It was thought the cows would catch cold and suffer. However, little by little the better class people put their cowsheds in order, and others, seeing the benefit, followed, and the advantages are now apparent. Our milk is practically free from tuberculosis, whereas milk imported into the City from the country contains a great deal of tuberculosis. It is a very great reproach on the country districts that such a thing should be, considering the advantages which they have over cowkeepers in the town.

1281. Supposing the rural authorities were moved up to the same level of activity as Liverpool, would they have a much more difficult task than you have had?—They would have a much easier task.

1282. Do I understand that with the country buildings the shippens and so on are in a very bad state?—Many of them are. Perhaps from the point of cost it might be a somewhat more difficult task; but the surroundings, the open air and so on, would facilitate the task.

1283. What about public opinion; do you think that it is as strong in the rural districts in favour of the alteration of cowsheds as it is in the towns?—No; the matter is not so well understood in the rural districts; and I would like to mention a painful but common example of that. A man was prohibited sending milk into the City of Liverpool from a diseased cow, and he was called, under the terms of our Act, before the Committee to give any explanation he might have to offer as to why he did not attend to these things. The point I wish to illustrate is, the man's ignorance of and apathy to the risk he was running. He was asked: "What are you doing with the milk?" He said "I am giving it to my children," and no doubt he was. I believe he was perfectly truthful and he thought it a good thing to give it to the children.

1284. You try to stimulate public action in the rural districts by refusing to take their milk, do you?—Yes, and not only so, but by inviting members of the Councils to conferences and so forth, and putting the facts before them. The matter has been discussed fully, and I am bound to say they are making great steps; they are taking a very considerable amount of action.

1285. Do you think that other county boroughs are exercising this indirect pressure by refusing to admit tuberculous milk? Yes, I know they are, at Manchester, Leeds, and Sheffield, I think. I know that many municipalities have sought powers to protect themselves in the absence of any Act relating to the whole country.

1286. Assuming that the County Councils and rural authorities practically brought their districts up to the level of Liverpool, do you think that tuberculosis would practically disappear?—I think it would.

1287. And I understand you do not think compensation will help to bring that about?—No, it will discourage it, I am convinced.

Mr. Austin Taylor—continued.

1288. Do I understand you think there is no greater a hardship on the butchers in this matter than there is to many other trades which have to take similar risks?—Exactly; it is a business risk, and no doubt from time to time hard cases will arise with that as with everything. You may call it an accident.

1289. You do not think that alternative methods might be adopted, that there might be compensation paid in cases of hardship where absolutely there was no default on the part of the butcher or the owner, while at the same time steps might be taken to stimulate activity in the way of reform; or do you think they are mutually destructive?—I am afraid the two things would not go together. I should like to make it plain that it is not the amount of compensation which the Corporation of Liverpool would raise any objection to for on instant; it is the important principle of the injury to the public health which in all probability would follow. The question of compensation could only be a very trifling thing having regard to the number of carcasses seized; but that is not the point so much as the injury that is likely to ensue from the increase of tuberculosis owing to the removal of any sense of obligation from the owner or the cowkeeper.

1290. Would the admission of the principle of compensation have any bearing upon the Acts of Parliament relating to food inspection generally?—Entirely; it would absolutely alter the whole application of existing Acts. The Food and Drugs Act does absolve a person from proceedings if he can show that he was not aware that the article was adulterated, and if he can also show that he could not, with reasonable diligence, have ascertained it. In those cases he would be absolved from proceedings, but he would not be compensated.

1291. How would the principle alter all that?—If a man is to be compensated, it will, take for example, the adulteration of milk with water. There is no suggestion that water is an injurious thing to drink; it is a very excellent thing, but mixed with milk it is an offence to sell it as milk. If the milk which was found to be adulterated was seized and destroyed, and the person owning the milk was compensated for the loss, it is perfectly plain that it would put quite a different aspect upon the administration of the Food and Drugs Act.

1292. Do you mean that if the meat owner is to be compensated the milkman should be compensated, and so on?—Quite so; they all have the same risks to run.

Dr. Hutchinson.

1293. I think we have got it very plainly from you that you think that compensation in this case is absolutely unnecessary, and if it were given it would have to be applied also to milk, nuts and oysters, and everything else that is condemned?—Quite so.

1294. Do you also think, from your experience in Liverpool, that this risk is such a small one that it is a small business risk, and that the butchers are perfectly able to meet it under the present conditions?—That is my experience.

1295. Do you also find that out of the 536 carcasses that were destroyed a very large proportion

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Dr. Hutchinson—continued.

portion were those of milch cows which no ordinary butcher would buy as a good class of meat?—Quite so, that is my experience again.

1296. So that it comes, does it not, to a very small matter. Very rarely good-looking bullocks and heifers which are properly fattened are ever touched, are they?—Very rarely indeed.

Captain Ellice.

1297. Are these tuberculous cows sold as fat cows?—They are sent to the ordinary market, many of them.

1298. Are those that are not destroyed exposed for sale as meat?—Yes, those which are found to be fit for food, of course, are not interfered with.

1299. Are those carcasses very lean carcasses?—As a rule.

1300. I suppose you have never found any cases of artificial fattening among them?—No.

1301. Have you noticed any difference at different times of the year as to the number of tuberculous cows that are sent into the market; that is to say, are there more tuberculous cows sent in in September, say, or in the Winter months?—No, I have no statistics as to that.

1302. You do not know whether it makes any difference whether the cow has been fattened on grass or in the byre?—It would make a difference owing, not to the food but to the confinement.

1303. But you have not taken any notice of that particular point, I understand?—No, I have no figures.

Mr. Price.

1304. Do you know that it has been given in evidence that as a matter of fact it is very difficult to insure against this risk by the trade?—Yes, I have read some of the evidence.

1305. Would it not be much easier for them to insure if there was a uniform practice of inspection? It occurs to one that one of the great difficulties of insuring is the very great difference in the practice of inspection in different districts?—One hears a good deal of these different standards of inspection, but I question very much if at the present time these standards are so widely different as many people suppose, and as they undoubtedly were a dozen or 15 years ago.

Chairman.

1306. Before Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission, do you mean?—Yes, long before that Commission—long before 1898 no doubt there were cases of hardship then.

Mr. Price.

1307. My colleague, Mr. Gray, points out to me that perhaps I ought to have put my question differently. Is there not a great deal of difference in the standard of condemnation; that is to say, as to condemning the whole or part of a beast?—I do not think so. I have no great experience of what is going on in other towns, but I know pretty well what is going on, as I am in frequent communication with medical officers of other localities; I know fairly well what the principles are which guide their practice; and without going so far as to say that they were absolutely uniform, I do not think there is a great diversity amongst them.

Mr. Price—continued.

1308. It does seem an extraordinary thing, does it not, that in point of fact the trade does not insure against this risk, if it is a reasonable risk to insure against?—Their reasons for not insuring against it, I take it, are expressed by the gentleman who said that those who are careful and skilful and prudent would have to pay for those who are careless and indifferent.

Mr. Kilbride.

1309. Do I understand that the evidence you are giving here is entirely confined to one particular class of animal affected with tuberculosis?—No, not entirely; it is limited to the experience that we have in the City of Liverpool.

1310. From your experience in the City of Liverpool and the evidence that you are giving will it be the correct for me to assume that it is mainly concerned with the class of animal which I may describe as the cowkeeper's cast off cow?—No, large numbers of animals are slaughtered in Liverpool, and very large numbers of carcasses are imported across the water from Birkenhead.

1311. You said 536 was the number of animals destroyed, can you give the Committee any idea what proportion of that number were cows, bulls, bullocks and heifer?—No, but I think you may take it that the majority were cows.

1312. I understood that the whole trend of your evidence was dealing with one particular class of animal. Do you know that sometimes show cattle which get a first prize at a Christmas cattle show will turn out to be tuberculosis?—To a very limited extent, which it is highly improbable would interfere with its efficiency for human food. It may make it a little less first-class, but still it is perfectly wholesome.

1313. Do I understand that your evidence does not in any sense at all apply to that class of animal?—No, you must not understand that. I was asked questions mainly about cows, but the principles apply also to pigs.

1314. You said you thought if compensation was given it would not tend to stamp out tuberculosis?—Certainly, it would not.

1315. Why?—Because it would make the cowkeeper more careless as to how he kept his cows?—Yes.

1316. That is your main objection, is it, to compensation?—So far as cows are concerned.

1317. Therefore, may I take it that your objection to compensation is the same with regard to a butcher who deals in a dairyman's cast-off cows of a low grade, and a butcher who deals in the best class of animal?—The same.

1318. Then your objection applies, does it, to giving compensation to a first-class butcher who buys show cattle, and who, having slaughtered them, finds them diseased, although to all appearance they are in healthy condition, and no one can tell they are diseased; but on the contrary, the greatest expert in cattle would assume that they were in perfect health?—I should no doubt have a stronger objection to giving compensation to the cowkeeper, because I think he has had greater opportunities for judging; but at the same time, upon principle, I should also object to give compensation to the other owner, the owner of the bullock well knowing

30 June 1904.]

Dr. HOPE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

knowing that the circumstances would be exceptionally rare in which the disease would have been so far advanced as to leave no mark at all on the carcase and yet the carcase to have been unfit for human food.

1318*. Would you draw the line at giving compensation between bullocks and old cows?—No. I would not give compensation in any case; I think it would be a wrong thing.

1319. Can you give the Committee any idea at all of what the weight of these 538 carcasses was which were wholly condemned?—They would be no doubt below the average weight and probably smaller than the bullocks.

1320. Would it be correct to say that on an average they did not exceed 4 cwts. dead?—Probably about that—about 500 lbs. probably. They would naturally have very much less on them than the fatted ox.

1321. Are the Committee to assume that in your evidence you were entirely dealing as to class of animals slaughtered, with the cow?—No, there is no reason why the Committee should assume that.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1322. The honourable Member asked you whether you knew of any difference between a cow fed on grass and coming in to be slaughtered, and another fed in an ordinary shippon or byre, and whether the one was likely to be more affected with tuberculosis than the other?—I understood the question to be a question of place rather than of food; I think the question of food is a secondary one.

1323. But what do you say, having regard to the place which it occupied before it came to be slaughtered?—No doubt there are more tuberculous animals in certain districts of the country than others.

1324. Very few cattle come to Liverpool to be slaughtered in the summer, I suppose?—Not a large number.

1325. They mostly come about October and November, do they not?—Yes.

1326. Have you any statistics on that point?—I have no statistics on that point.

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

1327. May the Committee take it that the large majority of cows come in about the end of October and in November and December for slaughter?—Yes; in Liverpool, as you know, there is a very large importation from Birkenhead, and a great deal of foreign meat is sold. The local supply and the foreign supply fluctuate. I do not know that there is any direct connection, but I have noticed that year after year when the local supply is less the import supply is greater; when the imports are less the local supply is more. I have no doubt it is a question of supply and demand.

1328. Is it your belief that tuberculosis would disappear in time if proper sanitary measures were adopted in the keeping of the cows?—Yes, in time.

1329. Can you tell the Committee what amount of cubic space per cow is allowed in Liverpool?—600 cubic feet.

1330. Is 600 cubic feet found to be sufficient?—Yes; it is really more a question of light and ventilation than of cubic space, though I should prefer 800 feet.

1331. Is not 800 feet the amount allowed in country districts?—No, in country districts you frequently find 400 feet only allowed.

1332. But in the case of new buildings put up it is 800 feet, is it not?—Not to my knowledge. It is a recommendation by the Local Government Board, I know.

1333. Is it not the fact that there are fewer tuberculous cows come into the market now than formerly?—Yes, it is a fact.

1334. Owing to the fact that the disease is easier of detection, and the butchers do not so readily buy tuberculous animals?—Most likely.

Mr. Kilbride.

1335. Do you think that the food which is given to the cows has anything to do with the development of tuberculosis or with the susceptibility of the cow to disease?—It is possible that it may be, just as in the case of a man or a child, whose food is insufficient or is bad; it will weaken the constitution, but there is no direct connection.

Mr. FRANCIS HENRY EDWARDS, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1336. Are you the Superintendent of the Birmingham Corporation markets?—Yes.

1337. Have you heard Dr. Hope's evidence?—Yes.

1338. Do you agree with him in the effect which this Bill would have on the amount of tuberculosis in the country?—I have not the experience that Dr. Hope has; my business relates principally to the markets and the meat inspection; therefore, I am unable to express an opinion as to the effect generally with regard to cowsheds.

1339. What Committee has charge of meat inspection at Birmingham?—The Markets Committee.

1340. Does that Committee consider that if compensation were paid it should be paid out of

Chairman—continued.

Imperial funds?—That is so; that in any event compensation should not be paid out of the local rates.

1341. On the ground that the animals for which compensation should be given are not reared in your city, and very often are not going to be consumed in the city?—That is so. Large numbers are reared outside and sent in for slaughter, and a great quantity of the meat slaughtered is sent to districts around so that Birmingham ratepayers would be paying for the freedom from tuberculosis of meat sent into other districts.

1342. What is your practice in Birmingham as regards taking the butcher into Court. Do you take him into Court in every case when he is found with diseased meat on his premises?—No.

I think.

30 June 1904.]

Mr. EDWARDS.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

I think there were ten seizures last year of tuberculous meat, but there was only one prosecution.

1343. Were there only ten seizures last year in Birmingham?—Yes. That is as distinct from surrenders.

1344. Can you tell the Committee the percentage of carcasses seized to animals slaughtered in Birmingham?—Last year in Birmingham there were 162 beasts condemned.

1345. That is to say, either surrendered or condemned before a magistrate?—Generally speaking surrendered.

1346. Out of how many slaughtered?—I am unable to give you the total number slaughtered in the City. That figure of 162 includes the carcasses sent in on commission, that is animals slaughtered outside, carcasses slaughtered at the public slaughter-house, and carcasses of animals slaughtered in private slaughter-houses. I am unable to give you definite figures as to the total number slaughtered within the City. I can give you the total number slaughtered in the public slaughter-house, and a rough estimate as to the others.

1347. Will you tell us the number slaughtered in the public slaughter-house, and the number condemned out of those?—I cannot distinguish in that way. The number of beasts slaughtered in the public slaughter-house was just under 24,000 in the year, and there would probably be another 7,000 or 8,000 slaughtered in the private slaughter-houses in the City.

1348. Out of that number you say, do you, that 162 were condemned?—Yes, including, as I have said, carcasses which were brought in dead from outside.

1349. Does that number include bulls, bullocks, cows, and heifers?—Yes, all cattle.

1350. As regards pigs, what was the number?—291 carcasses of pigs were condemned.

1351. Out of how many slaughtered?—About, and this is an estimate, 175,000.

1352. Do you find the butchers very much against being brought into Court, and that they meet your requirements to surrender regularly and willingly?—I have always found the butchers of Birmingham to be an exceedingly honourable body of men who assist us to the utmost of their ability, and notify us of any carcass which they discover in any part of the City, with a view to our examining the same; and they surrender it if it is found unfit.

1353. Have you noticed that by this Bill that in every case the butcher will have to be taken into Court if compensation is to be given?—The matter will have to be taken before a magistrate; not necessarily, I take it, before a Court.

1354. Does a magistrate go into a slaughter-house to give the order for condemnation?—In cases where a magistrate's order is obtained the magistrate is most frequently brought to the slaughter-house, or the abattoir, as the case may be, or the place where the condemned meat may be taken to.

1355. So that there would not be that objection, would there, to appearing before a magistrate that there is now to appearing in Court?—There is not that objection; but there would be objection to the other recommendation which I believe has been made, that the matter should be taken before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1356. Would it be a very unpopular thing if a butcher was brought before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction?—Do you mean to determine the amount of compensation?

1357. Would it not be likely that the butcher would conceal the fact of having a diseased carcass in his possession rather than appear before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, and have the matter made public; if he had a diseased animal in his possession?—I do not understand that the Bill proposes that he should appear before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction. I do not think the butchers would conceal the carcass; I have no reason to suppose that they would.

1358. But a butcher would not feel disposed to make a surrender, would he, if he thought that the surrender was to be a matter of public notoriety?—I am not prepared to say that a butcher would conceal (and I am speaking of butchers as I have found them) anything in order to escape appearing before a Court on a question of procedure as to the settlement of compensation.

1359. Would it not be against him to have to appear in Court?—I think the proceeding proposed is objectionable from a butcher's standpoint.

1360. Would not it be human nature to object to appear in Court if he could possibly avoid it?—I think the idea of taking a man before a Court to obtain an order of this description is objectionable, because the association with that man's business with tuberculosis in the minds of people who would not understand the nature of the proceeding, would ruin his business probably.

1361. In the case of an animal not being greatly affected with the disease what is done in Birmingham?—If it is localised tuberculosis the part is condemned. If it is general tuberculosis the whole carcass is condemned.

1362. Do you know the amount of cases of general tuberculosis in these 162 animals?—These are all cases of general tuberculosis.

1363. And these were all condemned, were they?—Yes, these are whole carcasses condemned.

1364. Have you any statistics showing how many carcasses were surrendered as being affected locally?—I have not.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1365. With regard to your practice at Birmingham, do you follow the recommendation of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission, or not?—Do you mean with regard to the degree of disease which would constitute the desirability of seizing the whole carcass.

1366. Yes?—Not with regard to pigs.

1367. Do you condemn the whole carcass in the case of pigs?—We do not condemn the whole carcass where it is a mere local affection with regard to pigs.

1368. But with regard to cattle you do follow the recommendation of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission, do you?—That is so, generally.

1369. Have you any experience of the foreign cattle trade in Birmingham. Do you have much imported cattle?—We have a considerable quantity of imported dead meat.

1370. Is that increasing in quantity?—Yes, I should say the imported dead meat trade is increasing.

30 June 1904.]

Mr. EDWARDS.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

1371. Is the supply of home bred cattle falling off?—I am not in a position to answer that question. Generally speaking, there seems to be an increase in the supply of foreign meat and perhaps some decrease in the supplies we get at our particular market of English meat; but so far as the number we are slaughtering is concerned, it remains somewhat about the same.

1372. Tuberculosis is not found so frequently in foreign imported cattle, is it?—We do not find much in the dead meat we get; but then of course the dead meat has been inspected prior to its reaching Birmingham.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1373. You say foreign meat has been inspected before it reaches Birmingham, where?—I presume there is some inspection at Birkendead, if we get it from Birkenhead.

1374. I am in some doubt as to whether there is any inspection for tuberculosis under those circumstances. Do you know whether there is?—I believe there is.

Mr. Kilbride.

1375. You were asked whether the foreign cattle you got would be more free from tuberculosis than home fed cattle. Are Irish outfed

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

cattle, that come to Birmingham to be slaughtered, freer from tuberculosis than any others?—I am not in a position to say.

1376. How many of the 162 carcasses that were wholly condemned were the carcasses of low grade cows, and what did the carcasses weigh on an average?—I cannot give you the weight of the carcasses, but I should say that quite two-thirds of those 162 carcasses would be emaciated carcasses.

Mr. Price.

1377. All cows?—No, mostly cows; probably three-fourths of the whole number would be cows.

Mr. Kilbride.

1378. Generally speaking, would you class three-fourths of the 162 as cast off cows?—Many of them were carcasses of cows bought perhaps speculatively, and brought in and slaughtered with a view to submission to inspection before being offered for sale.

1379. Do you mean that the cows were bought with the general intention on the part of the buyer of running the gauntlet?—Not the slightest, I mean that he bought them perhaps at a low rate with a view to submitting them to inspection before he offered them for sale.

Mr. ANDREW EMERSON KESSEN, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1380. I understand you are a member of the Hull City Council, and Chairman of the Sanitary Committee. Is that so?—Yes.

1381. Do you appear here to represent the views of the Conference held the other day, and also, I understand, the Association of Municipal Corporations?—Yes. I present the resolutions of the meetings of Municipal Associations against the Bill. They are as follows:—"Resolved. That the provisions of the Bill particularly in regard to compensation, are most objectionable, but assuming that there is to be compensation, such compensation should be paid out of Imperial and not out of local funds. That representatives from the following towns be requested to give evidence in support of the above resolution, and against the provisions of the Bill, namely, Liverpool, Birmingham and Hull. That a copy of the above resolution be forwarded to the London County Council Conference."

1382. Have you heard the evidence as to this being a trade risk?—Yes.

1383. Do you agree with it?—Perfectly.

1384. I want to ask you a question about a system, which I understand prevails in Hull, of insurance of marketable animals by butchers. Is there such a system?—Yes.

1385. Can you tell the Committee what they pay to insure the animals?—They pay 1s. for a bullock or a maiden heifer, and 2s. for bulls and cows provided the former have cost not less than 10l. and the latter not less than 12l.

1386. Is that a mutual insurance society managed by the butchers themselves?—It is a mutual insurance society managed by the butchers themselves.

Chairman—continued.

1387. If the carcase of an animal is condemned as unfit for food, what do they get out of the fund?—75 per cent. of what they have paid for the animal.

1388. Does the seller pay anything into that society, or only the butcher?—The seller gives them a shilling luck money, and they can do as they like with it.

1389. Does the luck money go into the fund?—Not necessarily.

1390. Does the Hull Corporation also wish to urge that if compensation is paid that it should be paid out of the national funds and not the local rates?—If it is paid.

1391. On the ground that Hull is a great collecting and distributing centre?—Yes.

1392. Can you give the Committee some figures as to Hull, showing the amount of cattle slaughtered and the amount of animals condemned?—Of bulls, bullocks, cows and heifers, 11,800 were slaughtered last year, and of pigs 23,000 were slaughtered last year.

1393. And of these, how many were condemned for tuberculosis disease?—36 bulls, bullocks, cows and heifers, 30 pigs, and two American bullocks.

1394. That is to say, only 36 cattle out of 11,800, and only 30 pigs out of 23,000 were condemned?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1395. Do you know of any other Mutual insurance company, such as a company formed amongst farmers in any district?—I know nothing about any other Insurance Company.

1396. The

30 June 1904.]

Mr. KESSEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Price.

1396. The number of cattle you mention as being destroyed referred to cattle totally destroyed, I suppose. Have you any particulars of cases of partial destruction as well?—Those are not included in the figures I have given.

1397. Are they numerous, do you know; can you give the numbers?—We have just now reorganised our system of meat inspection; we follow very closely the rules laid down by the Royal Commission, and we are rather strict in Hull just now. For a very long time a great deal of improper meat has been brought into the City, and we are exceedingly strict at present in seizing everything that we can that is at all questionable.

1398. Do you mean that there are a large number of partial destructions as well as the total destructions you mentioned?—Yes.

1399. Do you know how many?—I do not know how many.

1400. What was the proportion of cows out of the 30 beasts that you say were destroyed?—The cows were about 30 per cent. For the three months March, April, and May, we seized a whole animal about once in five days for tuberculosis.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1401. There must be a great number of partial seizures, I suppose, because otherwise there would be nothing to insure against. What is the insurance company for. It cannot be for the 30 animals out of the 11,000 surely, can it?—It is for all diseases; it is not only for tuberculosis, but other diseases are included.

1402. Whether the animal dies naturally or whether it is seized?—Yes, that is so. Of course it only refers to those slaughtered in Hull.

1403. Do you say that you are exercising considerable rigour at the moment?—Yes.

1404. Does that extend to foreign meat imported?—Yes, just the same; we seize right and left all the meat coming from Antwerp and other places. We have a very large importation of Dutch calves.

1405. Dead cattle?—Yes, all dead.

1406. Are there facilities for examining that foreign meat, and can you detect tuberculosis in it as easily as you can in the home product?—No, you cannot, because we have no abattoirs in Hull—they are all private slaughter houses and a large percentage of them were registered before 1847, and they give us a great deal of trouble. They are scattered all over the city, and we have to have a very large staff.

1407. My question was whether you can as easily detect tuberculosis in the dead meat imported, as you can in the animal killed in England?—Certainly.

1408. Then the parts of the animal are not removed, are they, which may be infected?—No, that would raise suspicion at once and lead to strict investigation.

1409. On the whole, do you think the rigorous steps you are taking in Hull have tended to give preference to foreign meat?—I do not know; it is mostly calves that come from abroad.

Mr. Kilbride.

1410. Have you any idea what percentage of 0.16.

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

American-born cattle coming into Hull the two bullocks which you mentioned represents?—No, we have no figures.

1411. Do you know what part of America they come from?—I have no information.

1412. Do you get any Irish cattle coming into Hull?—Very rarely.

1413. Can you give the Committee any idea of the average weight of the 36 condemned carcasses you mentioned?—I can only give you the value of them. The average value of the 36 bulls, bullocks, cows and heifers was 16*l*.

1414. Did you hear the evidence of Dr. Hope?—Yes.

1415. Did you notice him say that the class of animal that is generally condemned in Liverpool suffering from tuberculosis is entirely a different class from that which you have condemned in Hull. Do you get these worn-out old cows at Hull?—Yes, we do. There is a large grazing district all round Hull.

1416. But do you get the old worn-out cows from cowkeepers sent to you?—We do.

1417. But the very value of the 36 cattle condemned, which you say is 16*l* each, proves that you do not get the class of cattle I am talking about, cattle which will only weigh from three to four hundredweight slaughtered. You do not get that class of cattle do you?—Perhaps not, because they would not be passed, and people would know it would be no use presenting them.

1418. I understand 16*l* is the average price of the cattle condemned in Hull. Are your Corporation in favour or against compensation?—Quite against it.

1419. Assuming the class of animal that you condemned is worth 16*l*., do you believe it is possible for any expert butcher, grazier or breeder to be able to determine before slaughter that animals worth 16*l* a piece are suffering from tuberculosis disease?—I should think it is possible under certain circumstances.

1420. Will you kindly tell me what the circumstances are?—I should think it is possible, if the owner of the animal has bred the animal and has watched its career, to see if the animal is sickly or healthy; and if it is a milk cow, and begins to fatten suddenly, he would have his suspicions aroused.

1421. According to your evidence only 30 per cent. of the condemned animals were cows, so that 70 per cent. must have been bullocks or heifers. How is an owner to know in the case of bullocks and heifers; because he will get no milk from them?—No, but he will be able to watch the condition of the animal's health generally.

1422. But how will the butcher, who buys from the owner and who is the man who will have to pay, know of the presence of any disease?—The butcher knows perfectly well there is a possibility of the animal being in a tuberculous condition; that is one of the risks he runs, and he takes that risk.

1423. Did you ever hear of an animal that had gained a prize at a Winter Fat Cattle Show, probably selling at 30*l*. or 35*l*., turning out to be tuberculous?—I have seen them.

I

1424. Are

30 June 1904.

Dr. JAMES ROBERT KAYE called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1424. Are you the Medical Officer of Health to the West Riding of Yorkshire County Council?—Yes, that is so.

1425. I want to ask you something about the first point which we are considering, which is, is the loss by seizure, a serious one as a whole. Can you tell the Committee anything about the amount of loss in the last seven years owing to seizure in the vast area of the West Riding with its one and a-half million inhabitants?—You may take it that on the average for the last seven years there have been about 60 seizures per annum of whole carcases and partial carcases combined, with only about five prosecutions per year.

1426. In an area comprising 130 urban and 30 rural sanitary districts?—Yes.

1427. So that do you think the state of things is very much the same as it was when Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission reported that they could get no evidence of a really serious amount of loss?—That is my opinion.

1428. As to the loss falling on the individual butchers, do you think there are cases of individual hardship?—No, I do not think so, we have had no evidence adduced to the County Council of anything of the kind, and the County Council of the West Riding have taken a great deal of interest, of course, in this question.

1429. Do you know personally of any arrangement by which losses are met by insurance?—Yes, we have such a system in a great number of places, particularly at Shipley where the butcher pays 6d. per beast, which is found to cover more than the amount of the cost of any condemnation of a carcase.

1430. Are the animals sold approved animals by the auctioneer for insurance, do you happen to know?—That I cannot tell.

1431. As to the butchers bearing the loss, do you consider it to be an ordinary trade risk, as has been stated by other witnesses?—I cannot but help thinking so?

1432. What is the opinion in the West Riding as to where the funds should come from, if there is compensation granted?—Assuming there is compensation, we say it ought to come from an Imperial fund.

1433. Is there not a special objection that any compensation would have to be paid by the County Council, while the County Council does not appoint the inspectors who condemn the carcases?—Yes, they have simply to pay and nothing more; they have nothing whatever to do with the inspection.

1434. With regard to protecting the county fund, if compensation is asked for in an unreasonable claim, do you think that could be done without a system of inspecting the cattle on behalf of the County Council before slaughter?—I think, amongst other things, there must be some system of inspection on behalf of the County Council, if the County Council are to pay.

1435. As to the effect on the amount of tuberculosis in the country, do you believe, with the other witnesses who have appeared to-day, that

Chairman—continued.

to give compensation would create a feeling rather of indifference in the minds of cattle owners as to the condition of their cattle?—Yes, I honestly think so.

1436. And would make butchers less cautious in their purchases?—Yes, I think that would be the tendency.

1437. Then to sum up your evidence, do you think the Bill would provoke attempts from other quarters to obtain compensation for goods seized as being unfit for food?—That is so.

1438. And you see no reason why there should be any preference given to any particular trade?—I do not see why there should.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1439. Do you think it would be any hardship on the farmer who had an animal which apparently was in good condition when sold, and which afterwards was found to be affected with tuberculosis, that he should get no compensation?—I do not think so; because from my experience, and I have had a good deal of it in examining cowsheds in the West Riding, the conditions are such under which the animals are reared that the farmers are cognisant of them, and I do not think he ought to have compensation.

1440. Are the conditions generally favourable or the reverse?—I might say there is a great tendency to improve throughout the whole of the West Riding. The County Council have taken up the matter, and practically the whole of the authorities now have adopted regulations under the Dairies and Cowsheds Orders.

1441. How many cubic feet is allowed for each animal?—We never talk about cubic feet, because we consider that like a red rag to the bull in the case of the farmer; we always discuss the question on the basis of the arrangement of the floor space, and in that way we find a great many people give us what we want, instead of talking about 800 cubic feet which many of them do not understand.

1442. Do you think the accommodation is being rapidly improved?—Yes, I say so.

1443. And there is less tuberculosis, is there?—I am sure of that.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1444. Your authority does not appoint inspectors, I understand, for this purpose?—No, it does not have special inspectors; we get reports from all the inspectors.

1445. But as an authority you do not appoint the inspectors?—No.

1446. And as an authority you do not condemn the carcases?—No, but as County Medical Officer I am very often called in.

1447. Then your association with the subject would be merely as the paying authority in the event of compensation being granted?—That would be so under the terms of the Bill.

1448. And you object to the County Council being called upon to make a payment in connection with a subject which it does not touch in any other fashion, do you?—Decidedly.

1449. Would

30 June 1904.]

Dr. KAYE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

1449. Would that same objection apply if the compensation were awarded out of Imperial funds?—The County Council are quite opposed to any compensation whatever.

1450. You do now inspect as a local authority, do you not, the places in which the cattle are reared?—We do.

1451.—And you are doing your best to improve the conditions?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1452. That is part of your duty as Medical Officer of Health, is it?—No, it is not part of my duty; we do it on the report of the local Medical Officer of Health. If he refers to a cowshed as not being in a proper condition, then we, as the County Council, think we are justified in going into the district and inspecting the cowshed.

Chairman.

1453. Your connection is indirect, through the rural and sanitary authorities?—That is so.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1454. It does not arise then, I understand you to say, as a direct obligation imposed by statute upon you?—No.

1455. Have you been able to bring about considerable improvement within your area?—Yes.

1456. Does it occur to you that if a penalty were imposed upon the ratepayer or the taxpayer in connection with this subject, local authorities,

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

in order to avoid that penalty, would exercise greater care and follow your example?—I think that any compensation of that kind would be unfair, because a great number of the authorities have erected most excellent cowsheds, and you could not penalise them because they are not offenders. There are others, of course, apathetic and careless and who have not done as they ought to do.

1457. Do you happen to know of any instance where compensation is granted if the sanitary conditions are found to be thoroughly satisfactory?—No, I do not.

1458. You are not familiar with the French system, are you?—No, I am not.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1459. The Committee have been told that the rural shippens and so on, as to the bulk of them, are only fit to be burned; I suppose that is not the state of things in Yorkshire?—No, they are being rapidly improved. Of course there are a number of very old buildings.

1460. At whose cost are they being improved?—At the owner's cost.

1461. At the cost of the landlord?—Yes.

Captain Ellice.

1462. Have you noticed whether the majority of the tuberculous cows are fed on grass or in stalls?—No, I have not noticed that.

Tuesday, 5th July 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Kilbride.

Mr. Grant Lawson.
Mr. A. K. Loyd.
Mr. Spear.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart
Mr. Austin Taylor.

MR. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR.

DR. ROBERT SIDNEY MARSLIN, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1463. Are you Medical Officer of Health for the County Borough of Birkenhead?—Yes.

1464. Have you been so for the last 12½ years?—That is so.

1465. Is it part of your duty to direct the due inspection of meat in the borough, and are you also called in by the meat inspectors to see all diseased carcasses where there is any doubt?—That is so.

1466. How many carcasses do you see a year?—I should personally see about 30,000; the inspector deals with about 220,000.

1467. You have two slaughter-houses, I understand, in Birkenhead?—Yes, there is one for the town and one at the foreign animals' wharf at Woodside.

1468. Are they kept distinct?—Entirely distinct. Only the American cattle are received at Woodside.

1469. What quantity of foreign animals come, on an average, to Woodside?—The average for the last 10 years is 204,195; but last year the number was 218,628. For the few years previous, owing to the foot-and-mouth outbreak, the Board of Agriculture put a stop to the Argentine cattle coming in, otherwise the average would be higher.

1470. Have you kept a record for five consecutive years of the number of animals slaughtered at this wharf which have been condemned?—That is so. This record is the record taken out for the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis. Since then I have not kept any absolute record. It covers the years 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898 and 1899, and it will be fairly representative of facts at the present time.

1471. Will you give the Committee the figures for 1895?—This return shows that out of a total of 1,042,191 animals killed during five years, 665 animals were affected and dealt with by us—an average of 1·225 carcasses only.

Chairman—continued.

1472. What was the percentage of animals affected to the total number of animals?—About '6 per 1,000.

1473. You are speaking now of American cattle, are you?—Yes, I am not dealing with home-fed animals at all.

1474. I should like you to give the Committee the figures year by year, which show a considerable increase, as I gather, in the number of animals affected?—In 1895, 178,798 animals were slaughtered, and of those only 11 were affected with tuberculosis so far as we detected it. In 1896 the number was 223,014 and 53 were affected; in 1895, 241,717 animals were slaughtered and 113 were affected; in 1898, 204,892 animals were slaughtered and 258 were affected with tuberculosis; in 1899, 193,770 animals were slaughtered and 230 were affected; so that you will see there is a gradual progression in the number dealt with year by year. The total of the animals for five years was 1,042,191, of which 665 were taken.

1475. Have you any similar figures since 1899?—I have not the numbers affected with tuberculosis. They have not been tabulated.

1476. Do I understand you to say that you consider these figures show fairly what the state of things is at the present moment?—I think that is so. I think they show a fair record of what is taking place, judging from my experience of dealing with the animals, though I have kept no record; there seemed no object in keeping any record.

1477. What is the average value of the carcasses you deal with per year, do you suppose?—The average value is about 16*l.* each.

1478. So that the compensation would come to about 2,000*l.* a year, would it?—2,000*l.* a year at the present time if we only had to deal with the numbers we are dealing with now. Of course, some

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

some of the animals are worth considerably more, and the third quality animals are worth less than 16*l*.

1479. You would have other expenses as well, would you not, if this Bill was passed?—Yes, we should have to get a magistrate's order as to every carcase, and then there would be sometimes litigation over the value and the class; there would be all kinds of differences of opinion, and you would require to have counsel and so on.

1480. So that the charge this Bill would put on the Borough of Birkenhead, if it was carried, would be considerably over 2,000*l*. a year, would it?—I think so; it would be a very serious thing for Birkenhead.

1481. In respect of foreign animals alone?—Yes, it is as to the foreign animals Birkenhead is particularly opposing the Bill.

1482. Are the animals slaughtered at Woodside largely consumed in Birkenhead itself?—No; only 1·6 per cent. of them are consumed in Birkenhead.

1483. You have called attention to the fact that tuberculosis in these foreign animals is increasing. What effect do you think the Bill would have on that point?—At the present time the loss falls on the American owner. If there was full compensation there would be no object whatever in their stopping them coming. They would get full value and they would have the chance of running the gauntlet, or if they did not it would make no difference to them; they would send us all their diseased animals; it would make a ready market for all their diseased stock, which at the present time there is not in America.

1484. Do you think they would dump them down here?—Yes, there would be every inducement to do so.

1485. I understand the cattle do not belong to the people who slaughter them at Woodside?—No, they are only agents for the American owners.

1486. To whom the compensation would go?—Yes.

1487. To turn to home-fed beasts, are those slaughtered at another abattoir?—They are slaughtered at the town abattoir, where we entirely deal with home-fed animals.

1488. Can you tell the Committee the average number of those animals affected with tuberculosis?—I have the same figures with respect to them year by year as I gave before. During the five years which I have tabulated, to put it in round numbers, there were 3,391 cattle slaughtered and 77 were affected with tuberculosis.

1489. What percentage does that work out to?—It gives an average of a little more than 2 per cent. of cattle affected. Of course, a great many of these cattle come from the milk farms of Cheshire and Shropshire and adjacent counties.

1490. Can you tell the Committee the proportion, separating bullocks from bulls and heifers and cows?—I cannot give you that.

Chairman—continued.

1491. Can you tell the Committee the percentage of pigs affected to the number slaughtered?—There were 207 pigs affected out of 22,852 slaughtered, which gives very nearly 1 per cent.

1492. What is your calculation as to the cost which the home-fed animals would put on the Borough if this Bill were passed?—Taking the average value of the oxen at 17*l*., and allowing a proportion of the cost, I estimate the average would be about 14*l*., and if compensation had to be given we should have to pay for 26 carcasses per annum, which would amount to 364*l*. Then for pigs we should have to pay 3*l*. for each, which would amount to about 141*l*. per annum. Then there would be the expenses on top of that.

1493. What would that work out to altogether per annum, do you think?—About 525*l*. to 550*l*. per annum I estimate that.

1494. Do you know the amount of a penny rate in Birkenhead?—A penny rate yields not quite 2,000*l*.

1495. So that it would mean a little over a farthing rate, would it?—Yes.

1496. And if the foreign cattle were included it would cost you another penny rate?—Yes, fully a penny, and I think it would be doubled.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1497. Was it in Birkenhead that you had the case of Boyles, Brewster & Ramsden?—That was so.

1498. What did that cost you?—I cannot remember, but I think it was about 800*l*.

1499. Was it not nearer 2,000*l*.?—No.

1500. The case occurred under the existing law, I understand?—Yes.

1501. Your decision was contested, I believe?—It went to the Court of Appeal, and it was decided in two ways and the expenses were divided: so that unless I had the details I could not give you the facts. I could send them to the Committee if they wished. I could have brought you the figures had I known you wanted them.

1502. How did the contest arise?—I forget at this moment, we have had so many meat cases; but I think it was a dispute as to whether an animal which we took was affected with tuberculosis or not. The magistrate declined to condemn it, then the butchers would not take it from us. We declined to take it, and they declined to take it. Then they appealed to arbitration, saying that they had a right to compensation under the Act, the magistrate having decided against us. The dispute was as to whether they had a right to take it or whether they had a right to be heard at the condemnation, and it was finally decided that the medical officer had a perfect right to go before a magistrate and get an order, the butcher not being heard at all if the magistrate did not wish to hear him. At the same time an opinion was expressed that it would not be equitable to do so, but it would be reasonable that a man should

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

should be heard, and that if the magistrate allowed him to be heard then he would be entitled to his expenses. That was an important point, because there had been a good deal of expert evidence, and that brought in the costs of the hearing before the magistrate. Then the question was whether the butchers had a right to refuse to take back the carcass after it had been decided it was not to be condemned. The judgment was that they had no right to refuse to take back the carcass; if they had succeeded they were bound to take it back, though they could claim any damage which they could prove we had done to it by cutting or detention or anything of the kind. It was a very complicated case, and according to my own recollection it cost us about 800*l*.

1503. I do not want to go into the details; I only wanted to elicit the fact that disputes involving very heavy expenses are possible and do occur under the existing law?—You see it is always a case of expert evidence of the highest class, and the result is you have to pay for it.

1504. Would that case have been avoided were the Corporation empowered to compensate the butcher for the loss of that particular carcass?—No, I do not think it would, because it was a question of principle they were going on; they would have fought just as much, and we should have had just the same fight over five-pence worth of liver; it was not a question of the value of the carcass.

1505. Do I understand you to suggest that the compensation with regard to the foreign animals seized would probably amount to something like 2,000*l*. a year?—Yes, if we had to compensate for what we take at the present time.

1506. And for the home-bred cattle how much?—About 550*l*.

1507. You are aware, I suppose, that the supporters of this Bill disclaim all intention of seeking compensation in respect of foreign cattle?—I do not know that it says so in the Bill. Birkenhead feels that the Bill, as it stands at present, would do them a very great injustice.

1508. You have given figures as to the steady growth of the importation of foreign cattle. Is there a corresponding growth in the number of home-bred cattle?—No, I think, if anything, they have declined in recent years in number, but there is one matter with regard to the question of the home-fed cattle which raises a difficulty—that is, in Birkenhead they are bound to kill at the public abattoirs; there are no private slaughter-houses, or, I should say, there is only one private slaughter-house in Birkenhead, and the result is that all animals slaughtered in Birkenhead come under direct inspection, so that it has grown to be the practice very largely to kill outside the borough in private slaughter-houses. What the amount of affected animals is outside my boundary I do not know.

1509. Nor do I ask you to suggest; I merely ask what is occurring in Birkenhead. Do I understand you to say the importation of foreign

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

cattle increases, and the number of home-fed cattle decreases?—No, that is what I was combating, because you drew that inference from the fact that I said that the number of home-fed cattle was not increasing in my borough; I think, if those animals which are killed just over my border were brought in, the number would be considerably larger, and they would instantly be brought into the borough to be killed if this Bill is passed.

1510. Why?—Because I think that if there is any ground for suspecting the animal is affected they take it outside my borough. They have a greater chance in a rural district of getting it away than they have where it is killed in a public abattoir.

1511. Do you suggest the inspection is not so rigid outside your district?—I do not wish to suggest anything. They are not public abattoirs, and they are rural districts; but I say the butchers for some reason or other go and kill in private slaughter-houses just over my boundary.

1512. You tell the Committee, I understand, if the Bill were passed the animals now slaughtered outside would probably be slaughtered inside your borough?—I think so.

1513. But the compensation would be granted if the Bill were passed on the animal being seized outside, would it not?—Yes, that is so; but it is not nearly so convenient to kill in a private slaughter-house as in a public slaughter-house, and if it was equally convenient they would go to the public slaughter-house and we should have to pay the compensation.

1514. Supposing the compensation were paid out of Imperial and not out of local funds, would that mitigate your objection?—Of course, it would not affect us then, except as regards our share in the country's contribution.

1515. Have you any power to notify to the district from which the cattle have come, that that particular district is infected with tuberculosis?—We can notify them, but I do not know that it does any good if we do notify them.

1516. Are you able to trace it at all?—You cannot always trace it. You see, cattle are bought at open auction, and the butcher very often does not know where the cattle come from. The butcher, no doubt, could trace it to the farmer if he tried.

1517. In the case of pigs; where the dealers collect in a certain district, can you trace them?—We know that pigs coming from certain districts are more heavily affected, and as I have told the butchers who grumble at the pigs being taken, "Well, if you will buy from a particular district you know you will have a certain percentage taken." They have stopped buying from certain districts, and the amount of tuberculosis in pigs has gone down to half.

1518. Through avoiding those districts?—I think so.

1519. Cannot your local authority do anything to assist in purifying those districts?—Not beyond making a report to the sanitary authorities.

1520. Do

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

1520. Do you make such sports?—No, because there is a County Medical Officer of the district immediately round, who is taking precautions. Dr. Vacher takes every precaution with regard to the infected farms.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1521. You gave figures showing there was an increasing average of the beasts affected coming from foreign countries. Is that due at all to any change in supervision, do you think?—I think it is due to various causes. In the first place, the increase of population in America is contracting the areas where the beasts feed, and another thing is they are sending us a great many more cows. We used to get about 75 per cent. of bullocks formerly, but now we get a very much larger percentage of cows; and my experience is the cow is more subject to tuberculosis than the bullock.

1522. Of course the percentage of foreign cattle affected is almost a negligible quantity and cannot in any way be compared with the quantity affected at home; but is not the '6 quite misleading, because your figures show two per thousand in the last year you have given?—Yes, but we must average it, must we not, to be fair to the dealers? I do not want to overstate the case. Though you may be quite right, still I think we must be fair to the trade and take an average. I think it is more just to take '6 per 1000. If you look at the first year the average was very low indeed, only 11 animals were taken, and that of course reduces the average.

1523. If compensation were confined to home cattle, would Birkenhead's opposition to this Bill be modified?—The Corporation is not opposing it as to home cattle.

1524. If it were confined to home cattle, you would not object, would you?—As to home cattle the Corporation are agreeable.

1525. Are you agreeable to compensation being paid with regard to home cattle?—Yes, that is to say the Corporation are not opposing it with regard to home cattle.

1526. Why is the average so much less in foreign cattle, do you think?—They are wild prairie beasts, and have not been confined in shippens. They have been fed in the open, and are veterinarily inspected before coming. Another thing is that on every beast, before it is landed in Birkenhead, there is a cost of from 5*l.* to 6*l.*, and then there is the loss of the beast as well if it is condemned; so that the sender has every object at the present time to keep an affected beast out—the loss falls on the senders if they send a tuberculous animal.

1527. Then are there two reasons why the foreign animal has less infection, one being fed in the pen, and another that the diseased beasts are not sent?—Those are liable to confiscation, and then the loss falls on the people. They have all the expense of carting them here and the loss of the animal as well.

1528. Is the cause of tuberculosis in home cattle which you kill in Birkenhead to be found in the country districts?—Tuberculosis, of course,

Mr. Austin Taylor—continued.

is to be found throughout the whole country, especially in the wetter counties. It is due to infected shippens and infected meadows, and only the farmer can watch that. If he will not keep his shippens clean, and will not clear his infected beasts and let his pasture be fallow for a time, of course he will go on repeating the disease.

1529. It is the conditions in Cheshire and Shropshire, is it, that tend to make this state of things permanent?—You must not single out Cheshire and Shropshire specially, because it applies to all over England. I spoke of Cheshire and Shropshire, because that is where they come from to us.

1530. Because they are adjacent to Birkenhead?—Yes.

1531. Do you think the payment of compensation in those cases is a just thing?—Do you ask me my personal opinion or do you ask me the opinion of the Birkenhead Corporation?

1532. Of course, it is for you to decide with what opinion you choose to favour the Committee?—No, Sir. If you ask me the question, I will answer you in either way. If you ask me my private opinion I shall give my private opinion, whether it agrees with my Corporation or not; but I am here to give evidence for the Corporation.

1533. Has the Corporation put on record at all its opinion on this matter of compensation, with regard to home-grown cattle?—No. I think the Corporation, when I made my report to them, considered the question of compensation; and when it went to the Council, on the motion of certain members, a resolution was passed that a deputation should be sent to this Committee to say that they would not oppose compensation as to home cattle, but they very strongly felt it would be a gross injustice to them to have to pay on the foreign cattle. But with regard to whether it was a judicious step or not a judicious step, I do not think they expressed any opinion, and I do not think they would come to a unanimous opinion on the question.

1534. They did not express any opinion as to whether the payment of compensation would be likely to ameliorate the conditions which exist?—No, they did not express any opinion.

1535. What is your own opinion?—If you ask me my own opinion, I think compensation is a just thing up to a certain point; but full compensation is a novelty in the way of compensation, and would remove every possible motive for obliterating disease on the part of the persons who are perpetuating it. If there is no object in the farmer's mind for obliterating it, because he can get his full price for an animal, whether it is affected or not, then I think you are setting a distinct premium on them continuing to breed diseased animals.

1536. Do you get milk into Birkenhead from these county-fed cows?—Yes.

1537. Do you watch it?—We constantly have it analysed and examined bacterially, but I have reason to believe that at the present time most of the Cheshire farms are pretty clear, and I think

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. *Austin Taylor*—continued.

think that is the experience of Liverpool as well, from what Dr. Hope tells me.

1538. You think, do you, that you really do not get tuberculous milk?—There is not so much tuberculous milk as there was; the watching of it has improved its condition.

Sir *Edward Strachey*.

1539. I think you said, did you not, that the average price of a foreign animal was 17*l.*?—16*l.*

1540. Can you tell me what is the maximum, or what is the minimum price?—The maximum will go up to about 26*l.* I believe for a really fine bullock, and the third quality will come down to 12*l.* or 14*l.*

1541. Do you get as low as 12*l.*?—Yes, some of them are very thin, poor beasts—some of the Argentine beasts. I may say I got those figures from the Dock Board officials, the wharfinger, and the veterinary surgeon.

1542. Can you tell me with what sort of British animals would the foreign animals compete?—Most of them compete with the best class. Some of the foreign meat is as fine quality as any.

1543. So that if the price was reduced of the home-bred cattle, it would mean reducing the price of the best class of stock, would it?—I think the best class of stock will always fetch its full price in the market.

1544. But if there is competition between the two, it will be between the best grown England and the best foreign, would it not?—Yes.

1545. You attribute the larger percentage of animals affected, I understand, to the fact that so many more cows are imported?—Yes.

1546. Can you say what percentage more cows are imported?—I have not absolute data, but I should think we are getting fully a third more than we used to get.

1547. Can you say what proportion of cows as against steers are imported?—No, I could not tell you that.

1548. When you say cows, do you mean cows that have had calves, or do you mean maiden heifers?—Very often thousands come with the calves in them; they are actually cut out at slaughter. I have found upwards of 2,000 calves in a year taken from the animals after slaughter.

1549. Would the larger proportion be maiden heifers?—That I cannot tell you; you see they have stolen the bull on the prairie.

Captain *Ellis*.

1550. Do you inspect any other food at Birkenhead besides cattle?—We inspect all food.

1551. Supposing any of that is found to be unfit for human food, is it destroyed?—Yes, always destroyed.

1552. And there is no application for compensation in regard to it?—There is no compensation given for any other food; if you destroy vegetables or other things for instance.

Captain *Ellis*—continued.

1553. Do you know if your Corporation would be ready to apply the principle of compensation to other food as well as to butcher's meat?—No, I do not think they would.

Mr. *Loyd*.

1554. Were you examined before the Royal Commission presided over by Sir Herbert Maxwell?—Yes.

1555. Then we may take it, your opinion as to compensation is contained in your answers given there?—That is so.

1556. And there you express yourself in favour of compensation under certain circumstances, do you not?—Yes, I have always expressed myself in favour of compensation; I think it is a just measure up to a certain point.

1557. As to foreign animals that come over, as I understand, you really have no means of being perfectly certain that you have seen all the organs of the animal?—We do not see the organs as a rule; we can only see the carcase, because they are slaughtered at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 a week; the slaughtering is going on night and day, the slaughterers have every opportunity of removing the inner organs, and as a rule I have to judge of the carcase by the carcase as it stands.

1558. Do you consider the home farmer or butcher is handicapped as against the foreign importer by that fact?—No, I do not think so.

1559. Supposing the custom at Birkenhead is what you described it to be in 1897, and that the whole of the offal is removed and there is nothing to identify that offal with the carcase which you see in a totally different place, is not that a very strong handicap in favour of foreign meat as against home-produced meat?—It would be so, if one condemned the carcase on the offal, but after the Report of the Royal Commission one does not condemn it on the offal alone.

1560. Do you condemn it on the offal and the carcase?—On the offal and the carcase, but you really condemn it on the carcase alone. I will put it in this way: If you have a carcase of beef, with no sign of tubercle on it, and you have to go before a magistrate, it is no good giving him theoretical opinions; you must show him something tangible.

1561. Are not many of the glands which may be affected so embodied in the meat that there is no opportunity of discovering the disease?—They are all through the meat, and may or may not be affected, and you can only judge by your scientific knowledge in deciding whether the disease is localised in a particular set of glands, or whether it runs through the whole body. There are some glands in the neck which will be frequently infected, and it is a very common thing in pigs that you get an animal infected in the throat but the rest of the body is absolutely clear.

1562. You have to use your judgment, have you?—You have not to do an injustice to the butcher, and you have not to do an injustice to the public; but you want a long scientific training to

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Loyd—continued.

ing to judge how far that can be safely done. In those cases you pass the carcase. You do not condemn a carcase on the offal alone, consequently the home farmer is not at the disadvantage it would apparently appear he is.

1563. Is it not the fact that the offal and the carcase are not in any way connected in your examination?—Sometimes they are, and very often they are not.

1564. I thought the carcasses, according to the evidence, were taken to one place after having been cleaned, and, although the offal is kept for inspection, there was nothing whatever to identify any particular offal with any particular carcase?—Quite so, but during a great part of the time the inspector is present when the killing is going on, and may see the offal as it is taken out; but supposing you have 3,000 or 4,000 carcasses hanging in the slaughter-house, and out of those you find two sets of offal which are affected with tuberculosis and one carcase affected perceptibly with tuberculosis, it is a moral certainty that one of those sets of offal will belong to that particular carcase.

1565. Why has nothing been done to enable the inspector to see the whole substance together, the carcase and the offal?—We have no power to make them do so; in the first place, the slaughter-house is under the jurisdiction of the Dock Board.

1566. You admit it is a very serious drawback, do you not, that the inspector does not see the two things together?—Yes, it would be a great advantage, but Government has not given us the power to insist upon it.

1567. May I take it that in the case of foreign meat you really have a more superficial examination, because you rely on the more healthy conditions under which the animal has been reared, and the fact that there is an inspection on the other side?—No, I do not admit there is any superficial examination whatever; the carcasses are more rigidly inspected in a sense.

1568. The carcasses are, but under circumstances which you say do not give you the opportunity of fully judging?—I think you would find that very little would get past an experienced inspector. We know so well where to look for the disease that we can generally detect it if the carcase is affected.

1569. Do not you consider that the butchers all over England are being subjected, as regards their meat, to a much stricter and more effective examination than the foreign dealers are?—Of course, I cannot say what is done all over England, but I must say that the trade feels that the inspection at Birkenhead is one of the most severe in England.

1570. Is it not the fact that the home-grown beef and meat generally is subjected to a more rigid examination than is possible for you to give in respect of the foreign animals at Birkenhead?—No, I do not think so. I think you have a wrong impression there, and you will see why. In the majority of the towns in the country the inspector who inspects meat is an ordinary inspector of nuisances who has this duty tacked

0.16.

Mr. Loyd—continued.

on to his general duties. They cannot afford to pay a special expert in meat; they have not sufficient to deal with.

1571. Many of the Corporations do, do they not?—Many of the larger towns do, but only the larger towns. Where you have a large place, such as Birkenhead or Deptford, with specially trained men with very special facilities, the inspection is infinitely more minute as to foreign animals than the inspection is of many of the home-fed animals. I do not think the difference is as wide as you imagine. Of course, there is the disadvantage, as regards the home farmer, that you can get his offal, although you cannot always, because he buries it or throws it away if it is bad, and substitutes other offal.

1572. Then you say the matter is equalised, do you, by the superiority of the men who examine the foreign animals and not by the method adopted being equally good?—I think it is about equalised.

Dr. Farquharson.

1573. Of course, you do not personally examine that enormous number of animals you have mentioned, do you?—I see about 30,000 myself. You might wonder how that could be done, but there are often 3,000 carcasses hanging in the slaughter-houses at Woodside at one time. You go along them and see them, and of course an experienced eye can tell when a carcase is healthy. It is not always easy to tell to what extent a carcase is diseased straight away, but you can tell a healthy carcase at a glance after you have had some training. You do not learn it in a minute, but I have had a good many years at it, and I am called in to all doubtful cases.

1574. Have your inspectors had any special training for their business, or are they retired chemists and shoemakers?—No, my late inspector was a butcher with very special training under medical officers of health. The present one is a man who was trained at Aberdeen University, under Professor Hay, specially; he has made a speciality of the matter and has been an inspector for about fifteen years.

1575. What amount of infection is there generally found in the animals condemned?—That is a very difficult question to answer intelligibly to a lay audience, because it depends so much on the nature of the patch which is infected and its position. You may have a little localised patch on the pleura, which further examination might show to be a localised disease spreading from an infected lung. That might be taken off a carcase and the carcase left perfectly sound. Then you might have what appeared to be a very small infection of a particular set of glands, which might mean a very serious amount of infection throughout the carcase. It is an exceedingly difficult thing to persons not acquainted with the scientific side to make them appreciate where the difficulty is, and that is where these great lawsuits come in. It is a question of practical experience against scientific evidence.

K

1576. Were

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

1576. Were some of the animals condemned of sufficiently good quality to be eaten by the inhabitants of Birkenhead and other places afterwards for human food?—All that we condemn are made into artificial manure.

1577. Do you condemn an animal for a very small amount—a localised amount of tubercle?—Not for a localised patch, but, as I have tried to explain, the difficulty is to determine where the localisation begins and where the spreading through the animal continues; consequently that is a matter which wants a considerable amount of practical as well as scientific experience to determine.

1578. Do you as a scientific man say that an animal with even the smallest amount of tubercle can be fit for human food, or as fit as an animal that has not tuberculosis at all?—Yes, I think so. I think to some extent there was exaggeration in the minds of some of us when we originally began. I think, if the dangers were as great as were at first supposed, there would have been far greater evils than have occurred; therefore, I do not think it is right to condemn on the merest speck of tubercle a whole carcase. I think it is a matter in which a man must use common sense as well as scientific knowledge, and I lay great stress on common sense.

1579. You seem to think that a farmer ought to be made more responsible than he is at the present time. Do you think the farmer has really enough knowledge to determine whether an animal is tuberculous or whether it is not?—He has many means of getting to know. There are such things as farmers' unions, who could employ an expert to tell them, and it would pay them to do so.

1580. Can an expert tell?—He can tell a good deal with the tubercoline test. I do not say he can entirely eradicate the disease—he probably cannot—but he can certainly tell when the shippens were badly infected, and he could have them disinfected and precautions taken and advise, and I think after a time the disease would be got rid of.

1581. Do you think tuberculosis is encouraged by bad sanitary conditions and bad housing?—I think so. I think it is caused by uncleanness of the shippens; farmers do not keep their places as clean as they might. I do not mean they do not sweep the floors and sweep out the manure and that kind of thing, but I mean that they do not realise that an animal whose lungs are affected with tuberculosis is throwing its spores on to the feeding troughs to be licked up by the next animal coming in. The same thing is going on as took place with the people who slept in the little closet beds in the olden times.

Mr. Field.

1582. Is it your experience that home cattle are much more infected with tuberculosis than the imported cattle?—Yes.

1583. Can you give us any percentage?—As I say, my experience as to imported cattle is

Mr. Field—continued.

·6 per 1,000, and the percentage in home-fed cattle has gone up to 2 per cent.

1584. Those cattle, I suppose, were mainly from Cheshire and round about your own place?—I can only deal with the cattle which pass through my hands.

1585. Have you found any tuberculosis in the wild Argentine cattle?—Yes. You find tuberculosis in any kind of cattle.

1586. But not to so great a degree, do you?—No. Those that come off the wild prairies are not so badly infected; they are more so as you come nearer to the towns.

1587. You said that your inspector took a degree in Aberdeen, did you?—No, I say he was trained at Aberdeen; he took his diploma at Aberdeen.

1588. Anyhow, he is a man who knows something about his business, is he?—Yes, he has been specially trained for his business.

1589. Are you of opinion that there ought to be a standard of condemnation fixed?—No, I am not; I do not think it is possible to fix a standard.

1590. If you could arrive at some degree of agreement between the scientist and the practical man, do you think it would be desirable?—That is an absolute impossibility, because the practical man has not the necessary knowledge to understand what the scientist is talking about, and he can only look at it from the practical point of view of pounds, shillings, and pence. He thinks you are a day dreamer if you tell him certain things are there which he cannot see, and when they calmly tell you that they will eat a tuberculous animal with the greatest pleasure where the glands are proved to be affected, you can do nothing. I have seen a carcase with every gland in the body affected, and they say they would be very pleased to eat it. You can never agree with people under those conditions.

1591. Under those circumstances can you explain how it is there is such a difference of opinion among scientists themselves?—No, I cannot understand that. Of course it is a question of practice and knowledge as to how to detect disease. As I say, inspectors in one place are very different from inspectors in another.

1592. Are you aware that the Birkenhead Corporation, as I understood from the deputation, are in favour of giving compensation to the home breeder?—Yes, they passed a resolution to give him compensation, or rather not to oppose the giving of compensation.

1593. Have they considered, or have you considered, where the compensation should come from?—Of course, all Corporations and everybody else thinks it should come from Imperial funds.

1594. You would not like to give an opinion on it yourself, would you?—I do not think that is for me to give an opinion upon; it is for the Legislature to express that opinion.

1595. Do you know whether the Corporation have formed any opinion on the point or not?—I know that the Corporation have always expressed

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued]

Mr. Field—continued.

expressed an opinion that they were prepared to compensate people up to a certain extent, and they have constantly sent me to sanitary congresses to express that opinion.

1596. You stated in your evidence that you thought farmers should receive compensation. Are you aware that under the present system the loss does not fall on the farmer?—Yes, and I think that is where the pity is. I think the loss ought to fall on the farmer and not altogether on the butcher. The butcher buys in good faith in the open markets, and the whole loss falls on him. I have always thought, personally, the loss should be divided between the person protected, the person selling, and the person rearing.

1597. What is the total value of the carcasses seized by you per annum?—Do you mean foreign or home-fed?

1598. Both please?—About 2,500*l*.

1599. How much would be home-fed?—500*l*. home-fed, and 2,000*l*. foreign.

1600. It would cost you 2,500*l*. in Birkenhead, would it?—Yes.

1601. In a suspected case, do not you think the offal of imported beasts ought to be kept in the same way as the offal of a native beast?—I think so, but we have no powers to make the butchers keep it at the present time.

1602. I think that is a suggestion that might come from this Committee, because I am clearly of opinion that the men in the trade are handicapped by reason of that fact. Have you formed any idea of what would be the best remedy for eradicating the disease of tuberculosis in cattle?—My own personal idea is this: I should not compensate entirely; I should put some liability on to the person who rears the cattle, and the person who buys it, so as to make them interested in eradicating it.

1603. So as to create a co-operative interest in blotting it out?—Yes, and I think by doing so, and by making farmers have thorough inspection and have more county inspection of shippens, you will eradicate it; it is a thing that could be eradicated.

1604. Do you know of your own knowledge, if it has been eradicated in any country?—No, it has not been eradicated in any country, but there has not been much time to do it.

1605. You conveyed to the Committee that there has been rather an exaggerated opinion as to the injury done by eating tuberculous meat, and that a kind of terror has been raised on the subject?—I think so; I think there was an exaggerated opinion.

1606. Is it your opinion that if there were a reasonable inspection of tuberculous meat, and that less of it was confiscated, the amount of money to be paid in compensation would be much lessened?—Now you are getting to the same difficulty of what is reasonable and what is unreasonable. That is a question of scientific opinion to be expressed by a scientific person. You cannot average. Your inference, I take it, is that we are confiscating material now which ought not to be confiscated, or which, with the exercise of a little more judiciousness, should

0.16.

Mr. Field—continued.

not be confiscated. Of course I know nothing about what other people do, but I cannot admit in my own case that I confiscate a single animal that ought not to be confiscated.

1607. Are you aware that in Germany they sterilise this meat?—Yes, in Germany they have what is called the Freibank, and there they treat meat which is infected to a certain degree, and then they sell it to people at a poor price.

1608. Would you recommend such a system to be adopted here?—I would if it paid, and you were dealing with a sufficient quantity; but the people of England would not stand what they stand in Germany.

Mr. Kilbride.

1609. You stated that the average price of the animals condemned in Birkenhead was about 16*l*., did you not?—Yes.

1610. You also stated, did you not, that the animals which are mostly affected are cows?—Yes.

1611. Can you give us the average price of the cows as distinct from bullocks or heifers?—No, I cannot give you that. The trade could give you that information. I have not taken the particulars out. What I have given is the average cost it would be to Birkenhead.

1612. Would you be able to say that the foreign cows which you find infected are thoroughly nourished animals or only half-fed cows?—Some are very fine and some are poorer in condition.

1613. You said the average value of the home cattle affected in Cheshire is about 14*l*., did you not?—Yes, that is an average.

1614. Can you draw any distinction in that case?—I am taking the average of animals as it would affect us. I have not the details of individual animals, but I believe the numbers affected are stated in my evidence before the Royal Commission. I believe the figures were got out for that purpose.

1615. Would you be able to say whether the home cows which you find unaffected and which are killed in one of your abattoirs in Birkenhead are only half-nourished cows?—Some of them are very fine cows.

1616. Are they usually composed of what I might describe as dairymen's spent cows?—The greater proportion are—that is the difficulty; you get a large proportion from the dairy farms.

1617. Would you draw any distinction at all on the question of compensation, between the butcher who bought first-class carcasses and the butcher who dealt in this inferior class of beef, as to whether one man was more entitled to compensation than the other?—If you begin drawing distinctions of that kind then you would incur more expense in litigation than you would save by drawing the line. Every man would say, "This is a legitimate honest bargain," and no Corporation would undertake to go into a crusade to decide which is the reliable man and which is not; as a practical thing you could not do it.

K 2

1618. You

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

1618. You would not draw any distinction as to the weight of carcase you would give compensation for. A table has been handed to the Committee which shows that in some cases some animals weighed only two hundredweight?—It is obvious that would be a second-rate animal, and would come under the 8*l.* limit. I think you must draw a limit of price as you suggest, but you must not ask any authority to classify the butchers because they will not do it; though I could perhaps put my finger upon the particular man who might not be strictly honest.

1619. I do not want to suggest any inspection of butchers, but I want to know whether you think a public authority would be more inclined to refuse compensation in the case of this evidently inferior meat, and whether you think the question of weight of carcase, or the question of price per hundredweight of beef would be the proper test?—Obviously that condition should come in, but when it is a question of *bona fide* the man might say, "I *bona fide* bought it for so and so," and there is then the opening for litigation. We say fixing the price will lead to litigation.

1620. In your opinion, I understand the number of home cattle slaughtered outside your abattoirs is on the increase?—Yes.

1621. What evidence have you to prove that?—I know that a great many animals are killed outside my borough. People who used to kill inside do not kill inside now.

1622. Is that largely due to the fact that more of these home-killed animals were confiscated in your abattoir than in the private slaughter-houses?—It is due to the fact, as I say, that the reputation we have is that the inspection is severe in Birkenhead.

1623. You said you thought compensation was a just thing up to a certain point. May I ask up to what point?—I have always said that I thought the man who bred the animal should pay a third, that the butcher who bought it should pay a third, and that the public who are protected should pay the other third. I would divide it into three.

1624. Do you think it is possible for a butcher to trace the animal through the several hands that it may have passed through until he gets to the man who fed it?—The man who sells it would be answerable. I will guarantee if a butcher had the chance of getting 9*l.* out of the man who bred the animal he would find him out.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1625. In the event of compensation being given, you would not give more than three-fourths of the value, I understand?—The Corporation have expressed no opinion as to the proportion; they simply say they do not oppose compensation as to home produce.

1626. What is your own opinion?—My own opinion is that if you give full compensation it is a novelty which will tend to perpetuate the disease.

Sir Mark Stewart—continued.

1627. Then what compensation would you propose to give?—I would give two-thirds.

1628. Would you expect the Imperial Fund to pay one-third?—That I must leave to the Committee. I do not express any opinion as to that.

1629. Do you know a disease called *cliers* of the throat?—No, I do not know it by that name, it must be a local name; I never heard the word.

1630. In the event of the glands of an animal being affected so as to stop the wind-pipe and prevent breathing easily, would you condemn a carcase as diseased with tuberculosis?—As I explained to the Committee a little time ago, localised affections of the glands of the throat do not necessarily mean condemnation of a carcase.

1631. Is that generally the practice, or is it only the case in Birkenhead?—I think it is pretty general.

1632. What becomes of the tuberculous offal?—The tuberculous offal and the tuberculous carcases that are condemned are all made into artificial manure; they are treated with sulphuric acid and lime.

1633. Are they separated from the rest of the offal?—Yes, they are thrown aside.

1634. A considerable proportion of the refuse of other animals is thrown away, too, is it not?—No, nothing is thrown away; everything is used in a carcase. Everything that can be made into nothing else is made into manure.

1635. What becomes of the calves you got out of the animals?—They were made into manure; we pour carbolic acid over them.

1636. They are never sold, are they?—They would be sold to be made into veal pie if they were not caught.

1637. Have you known them to be sold?—There are hundreds of them sold.

1638. You said, I understood, that certain localities in this country were worse than others, and that cattle coming from those localities were regarded with more suspicion. Do you specialise any counties?—I could do so, but I do not want to; it would involve me in much trouble afterwards if I did. Experience showed us that certain butchers who were buying from particular farms had a very large proportion of cattle confiscated. They said, "Why do you do this, you take so many," and I said, "As long as you go on buying from that district you will have them taken." Evidently they have changed their district and are getting a different animal, therefore the inference is obvious that that district is affected.

1639. I suppose the Corporation of Birkenhead have thoroughly considered the question of compensation for home cattle?—The Birkenhead Corporation for years have been in favour of compensation to a certain extent.

Mr. Field.

1640. Were the calves that were found in cattle found in the imported cattle?—Yes, a great

5 July 1904.]

Dr. MARSDEN.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

great many of them, and they vary in size almost up to full time.

1641. Is the number of cattle coming in that condition on the increase or on the decrease?—Last year there were not so many as there were three or four years ago.

Mr. Kilbride.

1642. Did you tell the Committee what becomes of the offal of the foreign cattle which are found to be tuberculous?—The offal is

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

inspected as well as the carcase, but they are not inspected together. When the offal is taken out of the animals it is hung on hooks and taken to the offal house. A man deals in offal specially. The butcher who buys the carcase does not buy the offal. We inspect the offal in the offal house, and of course it is condemned and destroyed if affected. Sometimes I have known such a thing as its going into the river.

(The Witness withdrew.)

DR. FRANCIS VACHER, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1643. Are you the Medical Officer of Health for the County of Cheshire?—I am.

1644. Do you appear to support the evidence just given to the Committee by Dr. Marsden, because your authority has a foreign wharf in its jurisdiction?—Yes. We have a foreign wharf which is within our jurisdiction a little way from the Foreign Animals' Wharf belonging to Birkenhead; it is in the Urban District of Wallasey.

1645. Do you find yourselves much in the same position with regard to this Bill as Birkenhead?—Yes.

1646. Do you object to having to pay for these foreign animals if condemned, on the ground that you do not breed them and eat them?—We do not breed them, and we only eat a very small proportion of them.

1647. As to the foreign animals brought in, how many have you had slaughtered in Wallasey in the last five years?—205,000 odd.

1648. Can you tell the Committee out of those, what average number would be seized for tuberculosis in a year?—About four a year, a very small number indeed; 20 in five years, which is 1 in 10,000, but it would be a very different state of things if they had compensation.

1649. Would you say why you think so?—I think that inasmuch as the consignors, I am informed, are not paid for animals which do not pass, they take a great deal of care to guard the port of embarkation by employing very efficient and capable veterinary surgeons; but if they knew they would get the full price for any animal condemned on account of tuberculosis, there would be no occasion to go to that expense, and they in all human probability would not go to that expense.

1650. Do you agree with Dr. Marsden on that point?—Most certainly I do.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1651. Can you give the Committee the number of home-fed cattle slaughtered at Wallasey for the same period of five years?—No; animals are slaughtered in the county in private slaughterhouses ordinarily, except in the few instances where there are large municipal boroughs that have public slaughter-houses.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1652. Is the number you have given as slaughtered all foreign cattle?—Yes.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

1653. Have you the number of condemned home-bred cattle?—No.

1654. Do you agree with the previous witness as to his views on compensation?—Are you asking for my opinion as an official or my private opinion. The County Council are distinctly in favour of compensation.

1655. For home-fed cattle?—For home-fed cattle.

1656. Is your objection to the Bill founded on the idea of compensation being proposed for foreign imported cattle?—That is why I came here; entirely as to that.

Mr. Austin Taylor.

1657. Do you say that the fact of total loss of a condemned carcase operates as a check on diseased carcasses being sent from America?—I believe it does; I have no doubt about it myself.

1658. That is ordinary human nature, is it not?—Yes, it is. Owners of animals have to pay for their passage across and for the food of them while crossing, and inasmuch as they have to be slaughtered within 14 days after arrival, of course all the time before slaughter they are well fed.

1659. The total loss in that case is no more than the loss on home-grown cattle, is it. The loss on home-grown cattle that are condemned is just as great to the home producer, is it not?—Yes.

1660. Why, then, in the one case would ordinary human motives operate, and not in the other; do they keep all the tuberculous cattle in America?—They are very careful not to ship things which are likely to be condemned, and for which they will receive nothing in return.

1661. Whereas you think, do you, the owner of tuberculous cattle here is bound to slaughter them and take the risk?—I do not know that he is bound to slaughter, but there is a good deal

5 July 1904.]

Dr. FRANCIS VACHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Austin Taylor—continued.

deal of difference between farmer and farmer, and if a man is very careful he will not suffer so much loss as the man who is not very careful. It may not be always possible to detect tuberculosis in a live animal, but, still, many farmers will go much further towards doing it than others will.

Sir Edward Strachey.

1662. You say your Cheshire County Council is in favour of compensation? Have they expressed any opinion whether the compensation should be paid out of Imperial taxes or out of local rates?—I do not think an opinion has been expressed on that subject, but I have no doubt that they would sooner it was paid from Imperial taxes.

Captain Ellice.

1663. Do you fatten any cattle off the grass in your district?—I should say probably not wholly: It is very seldom done wholly.

1664. Do you know whether there would be more tuberculosis from feeding on grass than otherwise?—I think the more animals are out, the less they are liable to tuberculosis; the more you keep them in the byres the more you favour or encourage tuberculosis.

1665. What is the reason why there is less tuberculosis in imported cattle?—They have been kept under exceptionally good conditions. They are out in the air getting the four winds of Heaven.

Mr. Loyd.

1666. Are you clearly of opinion that the examination of foreign carcasses is more superficial than that which is applied to home carcasses?—Do you mean at the Foreign Animals Wharf?

1667. Yes?—I do not know that I should say that. Of course, if a man has to examine one thousand carcasses in a certain time, he is less likely to give the same attention to each carcass as he would if in the same time he had to examine only 200.

1668. And that is the case at these foreign wharves, is it not?—It must be to some extent.

1669. And besides that, is there not the difference that in the case of the foreign cattle the offal is entirely removed, as we have heard from the last witness, and the inspector merely sees the carcass in one place and the offal at another?—It is a great assistance to the inspector to be able to see the offal as well as the carcass.

1670. And he has that assistance in the case of the home cattle and not in the case of the foreign cattle, has he not?—He largely has it in the case of the home cattle.

1671. He has it to a much greater extent than in the case of the foreign cattle; he does not get it at all in the case of the foreign cattle, does he?—No.

Mr. Field.

1672. Are you aware there is no intention on the part of the promoters of the Bill to include compensation for imported cattle?—I do not know, I merely judge by the text of the Bill. I did not see anything in it excluding

Mr. Field—continued.

compensation for imported cattle, and I thought if it was not excluded we should be saddled with the expense.

1673. Do I understand from you that the Cheshire County Council are in favour of giving compensation with regard to home-fed cattle?—They are.

1674. Are you aware that the Cheshire County Council passed a resolution to give compensation in cases of anthrax lately?—That is so.

1675. Can you let me have a copy of that resolution?—I think so.

1676. Will you be good enough to send it to the Chairman. Human nature of course is the same in America as in England, but in America they do not send tuberculous cattle here, because they would not get any compensation. Is not that so?—If it is condemned they are not paid for the carcass.

1677. If you were an American importer of cattle into this country, in the case of an infected animal, would you like to be able to turn it into tinned beef?—I think it is quite possible to deal with meat in that way, meat that is slightly infected with tuberculosis.

1678. Do you think it is probable that is the way they get rid of it in their own country?—I should think it is an easy way of getting rid of it.

1679. Do you know if there is any similar way of getting rid of that class of meat in this country?—I do not know.

1680. Therefore, the home producer has no market except the ordinary market, has he?—That probably is so, but there is no reason why the system that obtains in Germany should not obtain here, though poor people would be some time before they were educated up to the point of consenting to eat meat, boiled by the Authority, at half price.

1681. May I take it that you are in favour of leaving the present system of inspection untouched, and that you think meat should be sterilised which is below a certain standard?—I am generally in favour of that. We have a standard. The Tuberculosis Commission recommended certain things, and the Local Government Board in March, 1899, sent round an official printed circular which has been our guide ever since. We are all guided by that circular now. Before that there used to be very much greater differences of opinion as to the proportion of tuberculosis in a carcass which would condemn it than there is now.

1682. My experience is altogether different. I know, at the present time, certain places where meat is confiscated on the smallest pretence; and I know that in many places the circular has been altogether disregarded?—After the recommendations of the Tuberculosis Commission, this circular was formally sent round, and it has been my guide, at any rate.

Mr. Kilbride.

1683. You said, did you not, that 1 in 100,000 of foreign cattle coming into your slaughterhouse is affected?—One in 10,000 is condemned on account of tuberculosis.

1684. Can

5 July 1904.]

Dr. FRANCIS VACHER.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

1684. Can you say where these foreign cattle come from?—Some from Canada, some from the Argentine Republic, and some from Texas, I believe.

1685. Have you any idea whether the Argentine Republic cattle are freer from tuberculosis than States cattle and Canadian cattle?—No, I could not say; it depends so much on where they come from. If they have lived all their lives practically in the open air, then there is very little risk that they will be condemned for tuberculosis. If, as occasionally happens, they come from the corrugated iron shippens in Canada, where they certainly do not allow the 800 cubic feet of air space, then there is a greater chance that they will be affected.

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

1686. May I take it that in your opinion to keep cattle in a fairly healthy condition and give them a fair chance against tuberculosis, they ought to have 800 cubic feet of space?—If they are out from morning to night it matters really very little how much cubic feet of air space you give them. Where cattle are constantly housed it is a matter of very great importance whether they have 300 or 400 or 800 cubic feet of air space. If they are out to grass all day, and practically all night too, it matters very little indeed what the size of the shippon may be.

Thursday, 7th July 1904.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Captain Ellice.
Dr. Farquharson.
Mr. Field.
Mr. Ernest Gray.
Dr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Kilbride.

Mr. A. K. Lloyd.
Mr. Price.
Mr. Spear.
Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.
Sir Edward Strachey.
Sir Mark Stewart.

Mr. GRANT LAWSON IN THE CHAIR.

MR. HENRY O'NEILL, M.D., J.P., called ; and Examined.

Chairman.

1687. You are consulting surgeon to the Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, and vice-chairman of the Market Committee of the Corporation, I understand ?—Yes.

1688. In Belfast you have a strong staff of inspectors of meat ?—Yes, we have a staff of one superintendant, four properly qualified meat inspectors, and one veterinary surgeon.

1689. And you also call in experts if necessary ?—Yes, we use the college there, and the bacteriologists of Queen's College assist also.

1690. Your inspectors there carry out the recommendation of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission, I understand ?—They carry out the recommendations strictly.

1691. Those are before us. What is your view as to the question of whether the financial loss is a serious one to the butchers of Belfast as a whole ?—It is a very serious one.

1692. You put in a table, I understand, showing the number of cattle slaughtered in the Belfast public abattoir and the number of tuberculous carcasses seized during the last 10 years ?—Yes.

1693. And the average price of the carcasses seized ?—I find we slaughtered 202,415 cattle from 1894 until 1903, and of that number our inspectors seized 1,033.

Chairman—continued.

1694. That was about one-half per cent. ?—Yes.

1695. About one beast in 200 ?—Yes ; and the cattle were of the average cost of 12*l.* each.

1696. The ones seized ?—Yes, the ones seized. That was an estimated loss of 12,396*l.* ; a very serious matter to my mind to the butcher.

1697. In 10 years ?—In 10 years.

1698. 1,239*l.* a year ?—Yes.

1699. You slaughtered 202,415 cattle ?—Yes.

1700. What did you take their average value at ?—The average value of the cattle slaughtered is from 10*l.* up to 20*l.* in the public abattoir. They are generally good.

1701. Would you take 16*l.*, which another witness gave us, as the average figure ?—I should say that would be a fair average. We have made it 12*l.* here as a fairly low average.

1702. That is for carcasses seized ?—Yes.

1703. Which were presumably not the best beasts ?—No, they were not, but they were fairly good, better than some that were passed.

1704. On the whole, would you say 16*l.* that was a fair price ?—Practically.

1705. Then

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

1705. Then on the cattle slaughtered it comes to 3,238,640l.?—Yes.

1706. And out of that 12,396l. was lost?—Yes.

1707. Out of 3,238,640l.?—I did not calculate it out in the way you have done, but this is the average—which I have given you in the schedule.

1708. Were these carcasses entirely destroyed?—Yes.

1709. I thought you acted on Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission?—Yes, we do. What I mean is that these I have mentioned here were entirely destroyed. This was the entire cost of them, as far as I understand. We do act upon it, but this is the cost of the carcasses which were seized.

1710. Whether they were destroyed wholly or not?—Yes, that is so.

1711. So that out of these there was a certain amount of meat which was not destroyed but returned to the butcher?—Yes, after we took away the diseased part and destroyed it.

1712. So that is a deduction from the 12,396l.?—Yes.

1713. You could not tell us how much that would amount to?—No, I could not. But in the great majority it was the complete carcass.

1714. You take these cattle seized, I see, at an average of 12l. each?—Yes.

1715. I suppose many of them would be under 8l.?—No, not in the public abattoir; but the 8l. cattle are not brought in as a rule, they are killed outside the city. There are six slaughterhouses outside the city boundary, and the cheaper cattle are slaughtered there. Since our inspection has been very exact, as it has been during recent years, we find more slaughterhouses have been built just outside the city margin; there are at present six close to the city margin. These cheaper cattle are taken out there.

1716. But you have a method of inspecting the meat when it comes into Belfast, I gather?—Just to correct ourselves from this abuse, we had a bye-law passed by the City Corporation, on 15th September, 1900, and confirmed by the Local Government Board on the 9th of February, 1901, enabling us to inspect all meat brought into the city from outside. We have this at the Central Meat Market; and it has been carried on since.

1717. Can you give us any idea of how much meat is seized on that inspection?—Yes; during the year 1901, the first year it was established, we inspected 1,764 carcasses and seized 14; during 1902 we inspected 3,152 carcasses, and of this number we seized 15. Last year, 1903, we inspected 6,751 carcasses, and of these we seized 25.

1718. And I think you said that you suspected that the poorer cattle were slaughtered outside and sent in?—Yes.

1719. And when you came to examine them, out of 6,751 you could only seize 25?—Yes; but

0,16

Chairman—continued.

you will understand that they sent only the good parts in and kept the diseased parts and gave them to neighbouring towns where there is not any inspection. That is our point, that they take them to neighbouring towns where there is scarcely any inspection. We get the benefit in the city of having a pure meat supply, by means of this bye-law, and hence on the face of it it looks small; but it is a very great check upon giving bad meat to the citizens of Belfast.

1720. I do not say it is not sound; it is a pity that other places do not adopt it. Your opinion as to the loss to individuals is that there is great loss?—Yes, great hardship and loss.

1721. Can you give us any instances of loss to individuals?—Yes, I can; but I may say that although I know these three persons whom I am giving you, who have suffered very severely. Inspector Neeson who has accompanied me, and whom I will respectfully ask you to hear, can bear personal testimony to the facts I am about giving, and I had hoped you would ask him. He is a practical butcher and is our Meat Inspector, and he knows these gentlemen personally and how they have suffered. If you wish it I can give you the evidence, but it is coming from me secondhand.

1722. The Committee will take the evidence from you,—there is no one here to dispute it. I will ask you not to give names, please?—One man had a carcass seized on January 9th, 1899, another one seized on March 10th, 1899, and another on May 18th, 1899, and a fourth on July 20th, 1899, and the prices at which these cattle were bought ranged from 12l. to 20l. each. That man was completely put out of the business, and became a labourer, I believe a scavenger on our streets, in abject poverty, and has since died.

Mr. Field.

1723. It broke his heart, I suppose?—I could not say exactly, but it did not help him.

Chairman.

1724. About this man—this was all in 1899, I gather?—Yes; all those four were seized, and it simply cleared him out of the trade absolutely.

1725. But were you using the recommendations of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission in 1899? It did not report till 1898. Was your system of destruction then the same as it is now?—Yes, and more strict; but we did not adopt the recommendations of the Tuberculosis Commission then. We practically seized the entire carcass in those early days; we were more strict against the butchers then than we are now. We give the butchers now the part that is not diseased, since we have followed the recommendations of the Commission, after we have taken the diseased part away.

1726. What is your next case?—The second

L

CASE

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued

case was a butcher who had one carcase seized on November 26th, 1899; one seized March 3rd, 1900; and one seized March 24th, 1900.

1727. Were these cows or bulls?—All cows.

1728. And in the first case were they all cows?—Yes. The third animal, as I say, was seized on the 24th March, 1900, and the fourth one was seized on March 29th, 1900. The prices of these cattle ranged from 8*l.* to 16*l.* each. This man was completely put out of the business, and now he is what is called a jobber; he gets a few shillings commission for buying a cow for a person, but he is entirely out of the trade.

1729. Your first man, if he gave 20*l.* for each of the cattle, would lose, on an average of 16*l.* each, 72*l.*; 72*l.* put him out of the business?—Of course he lost the trade as well, from being exposed, having the cattle seized; it destroyed his trade by exposing him to the public, as well as the financial loss.

1730. Give us your third case, please?—This man had one seized the 19th of January, 1899.

1731. Have you a more recent case? I think it would be more satisfactory to the Committee if you could give us a case since you adopted Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission's recommendations?—We are now complying with the Royal Commission, and before that time we could not give them as accurately as we give these. It was accuracy that I wished to give, not heresay. Therefore, that is why I give this case, though it was in 1899. The first animal was seized on January 19th, 1899, the second one on February 18th, 1899, the third on February 25th, 1899, and the fourth on March 11th, 1899. The prices for these cattle ranged between 5*l.* and 10*l.* That man was completely put out of the business of a butcher, and he now, after going about as a poor man for some time, has emigrated to South Africa.

1732. I assume that those were cows?—Yes, those were cows.

1733. You have something to say about insurance, have you not?—Yes. We have in Belfast two large cattle sale yards, and the insurance of the butchers for cattle in Belfast is carried out by a fixed charge of 1*s.* per head, whether ox or cow, made my arrangement in the sale yards of the city, the seller paying the sum to the buyer.

1734. They do not pay it into a fund, but they pay it from one to the other?—No, they pay it into a fund. This money is given to the Master Butcher's Protection Society by the auctioneer. He takes 1*s.* for each cow or ox which is sold, and at the end of the sale he transfers it over to the society; this society then pays any of its members who has lost a cow the entire cost of the animal.

1735. I gather that if the funds are not sufficient they make a levy on their members?—Yes, they do. Owing to the insufficiency of this levy, many butchers have had to leave the Society of which they were members, owing to the frequency and magnitude of the calls made on them to recoup the losses of other

Chairman—continued.

members. They preferred to take the risk of seizure themselves rather than pay the heavy dues, which in some weeks, I understand, amounted to 8*s.* per head of cattle.

1736. I think the figures you have shown us show that over the whole average of 10 years, 10*s.* per cent. on the value of the animals would have covered the loss?—Yes.

1737. Yet you say there was a loss in some weeks of 8*s.* per head?—Yes. I was just giving the instance of this Master Butcher's Protection Society, which is the only one in Belfast, and does not apply to cattle sold in the public market, it only applies to the cattle sold in these two sale yards.

1738. Can you express the opinion of your Corporation as to how the loss should be borne?—We have gone into the thing very carefully, and we consider that the loss should be borne by the public funds, provided that no compensation be given for beasts under 8*l.* in value.

1739. Have you a resolution of the Corporation to that effect?—No. The Diseases of Animals' Acts, 1894, we consider should be scheduled, and apply; it forms a precedent for compensation in cases of tuberculosis in Chapter 57, Section 14, Sub-section (3); and Section 15, Sub-section (2) covers the case so far as our Committee consider necessary.

1740. The first of those clauses deals with the foot and mouth disease, and the second with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, we look upon it in this way. Tuberculosis is a contagious disease and so is pleuro-pneumonia. Each comes in insidiously from an outside source, neither belongs to the cow or the ox, it is brought in by an outside source, that is, the presence of this germ which we know now is the cause of tuberculosis is the Tuberculosis Bacillus. In each case the cow or ox may be perfectly healthy as regards disease, but when exposed to contagion, may be contaminated. We say, in common justice, if a farmer has a cow suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, suffering from a contagious disease brought from the outside into that cow, into her lungs and pleura,—if he is compensated according to this clause I have mentioned, for that one contagious disease which he had no part in bringing into his byre, he has as good a right to be compensated in the second case of tuberculosis; which he did not bring into his byre or into his cow,—it was there; she became infected in some way by it, and he may be entirely innocent. Therefore, we say, if it applies in the former case (and it applies since long before 1894), why should it not apply in this latter case?

1741. You say, he being entirely innocent?—Yes.

1742. Do you consider that the state of the byre has no effect on the health of the cattle?—Yes, but the byre did not bring the tuberculosis. The state of the byre, the state of ventila-

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued]

Chairman—continued.

tion encourages it, but it does not bring it,—it is there; it is of foreign growth; we know that in the human subject; and we know it is the same in pleuro-pneumonia, or you may just as well say of scarlatina with the human subject.

1743. You have mentioned Sections 14 and 15; have you considered Section 16 of that Act with regard to swine?—Yes. I did not wish to weary you to-day; I wished to draw your attention to the fact that that Act applies exactly to what I recommend.

1744. But the compensation for swine is not on the same basis as for other cases?—I did not wish to weary you. I took the cattle as a sample case, at all events of pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis, both being contagious diseases. I say, if the Act applies to one, as we know it does, why should it not, in justice to the butchers, apply to the other.

1745. Swine fever is a contagious disease?—Yes.

1746. The State does not give full compensation in the case of swine fever?—No, but I thought it would be wiser to deal with the cattle. I gave you the Schedule of the Act, and I say that that is for this Committee to be guided by.

1747. But as a matter of fact, as you know, in swine fever the compensation is only one-half?—Yes, I know that.

1748. I think the rest of your proof deals with things which are outside the reference to this Committee?—Very well.

1749. How do you consider that the granting of compensation would effect the stamping out of tuberculosis?—When at present a butcher buys a cow in the open market in Belfast, in good faith, and when that cow is taken to the abattoir, and killed, if it is found to be suffering from tuberculosis the animal is seized, and he loses the entire carcase—that is, the value of it which would be 12*l.*, 16*l.*, or 20*l.* That has occurred so frequently in our city that there is a dread among the butchers, many of them, that this cow which they have paid their 20*l.* for, may be seized; and I have shown you three instances where men have been put out of the trade for no fault of their own. There is a dread among the butchers that they may also suffer financially. If compensation were given, as I have suggested, as in pleuro-pneumonia, it would inspire confidence in each butcher, that if he exercised ordinary care in purchasing a beast in the open market, and proved it to the city authorities who have charge of this department, then, supposing the beast were affected with tuberculosis, he would at least get some return for his outlay, and he would more willingly bring the cattle into an abattoir and have them slaughtered there, where our inspectors would see the meat and examine it, and if sound would transfer it to our citizens. On the other hand, when not compensated, he would take it out to one of the six slaughter-houses round the city, where there is no inspection.

Chairman—continued.

1750. But the point that the Committee want to know is, how you think that compensating for the dead animal would stamp out the disease in the living animal?—You hardly understand me as saying that. I did not say that. What I said was that it would be one element in removing the disease. I have my recommendations, which you have not asked me about, and one is for stamping it out. My reason for which is clear and distinct and very short.

1751. You mentioned in your proof certain methods by which it might be stamped out, which are beyond our inquiry. What we want to know from you is what effect you think giving a butcher compensation and so preventing his having any loss if a beast was tuberculous would have upon his putting such meat on the market. Would he not be more likely to put it on the market if he was not to have any loss?—Yes. What I wish the Committee to understand is, that he would bring that beast into our public abattoir. At present he takes it out of the city and we cannot watch him. They are very subtle gentlemen, these butchers, and our officers can hardly watch them bringing in the meat when there may be germs of tuberculosis in it, which are only recognisable by the most minute examination, and it may escape our inspectors. If this element of fear on his part is taken away, he will bring all his animals into our abattoir. Hence he has no reason to cheat us. At present there is a very tangible reason while human nature exists as it is. He says, I am not going to run the risk of losing my beast, but if you will give me compensation I shall bring it for public inspection to the public abattoir.

1752. Your point is that there would be less fear of tuberculous meat being sold for food?—Exactly.

1753. That hardly bears upon the point, how it would prevent tuberculosis increasing in your country?—It would be one link in the chain of remedies. I have given you the early links in that statement of mine, and with your permission it will not take me a minute to go through them. I look upon it that this is only a very partial thing in the remedy, unless we go deeper; and my opinion is that legislation should go deeper—that this is only one link, and we wish for another one or two. As a medical man, and one interested in the welfare of our citizens as well as of our butchers, my duty is to protect our people from diseased meat, and I say that this is only one very small part of the remedy. I say that you should stamp it out at the inception, as you did with pleuro-pneumonia. We have not had a case for 20 years in Belfast; you have stamped it out absolutely. This is a far more dangerous disease to our people.

1754. We cannot do it under the Bill which is referred to our Committee; we are only charged with the subject of dead meat.

L 2

1755. I think

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray

1755. I think you have made it pretty clear that in your judgment the law as it at present stands does not encourage the butcher to disclose?—No, it does not.

1756. Is it at all possible to trace the animal back to the buyer?—My friend tells me that it is not easy, because it may go through various hands before it goes to the hands of the butcher, who finally has it from whom it is seized.

1757. Then let me put this to you, and perhaps you can consult your friend, if the Committee will allow you: When a butcher in the open market purchases a cow or an ox, would he in every case know the person from whom he purchased it?—Yes, he does in the great majority of cases; but he does not know through whom it previously has come.

1758. I will deal with that in a moment. He knows the person from whom he purchases it?—Yes, generally.

1759. If that person be the breeder of cattle, it would not be difficult in that case to ascertain where the animal was bred?—No.

1760. If the person were a dealer it would be more difficult?—Yes.

1761. But it would be possible in the generality of cases?—No.

1762. Not where it is brought through a dealer?—Not in our city.

1763. When an animal having been purchased is found to be diseased, can the butcher refuse to accept delivery?—No, he cannot refuse.

1764. The transaction is completed?—Yes, in the open market.

1765. The loss falls upon him?—Yes, absolutely upon the butcher.

1766. Do you think that if compensation were granted it ought to be payable out of Imperial or out of local funds?—Imperial.

1767. Why?—The City of Belfast is a market for cattle from the neighbouring counties of Ulster, and if it were paid out of local funds we would get the inferior cattle from Antrim, Armagh, Tyrone, Down, Donegal, and as far as Longford; and, in fact, from Dublin. It would be a very heavy tax to be placed on the people of Belfast to pay for these diseased cattle brought in from neighbouring counties, and a most unfair condition.

1768. Supposing it were payable out of Imperial funds, and an attempt were made by your local authority to trace the cattle back to the district where they were bred, would you or would you not favour the payment of compensation in cases where the breeding-places were found to be in an insanitary condition?—I would certainly refuse it if I found the conditions unhealthy.

1769. If the local conditions were insanitary, you would not give the compensation?—No.

1770. But if the conditions were sanitary and tuberculosis had arisen in the animal in spite of

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

the sanitary conditions, then compensation would be granted?—Certainly.

1771. Now, then, you holding that opinion, would such a method in your judgment tend to stamp out tuberculosis?—Yes.

Mr. Spear.

1772. A good many of the cattle, I take it, could not be traced to the breeder, because they have been bought by graziers, who have fattened them?—That is so.

1773. Would it be possible to trace the breeder of the cattle, therefore?—I do not think so. Under present conditions in Belfast, I think not.

1774. If the compensation was paid out of Imperial funds, would you recommend that foreign cattle should be compensated for out of Imperial funds?—I do not like to go into that, I would rather not answer that.

1775. I would like to know, just for information, in case that was done, would it not encourage foreigners to send their diseased cattle here if the owners of these cattle were exempt from any liability?—I am speaking here throughout of our home meat. I have not touched the foreign question at all, and I would rather not.

1776. Only that is one of the difficulties that we have to consider?—Yes.

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell.

1777. I understand that the reason why you are most anxious for compensation is, that you think it would induce butchers to bring their animals to the public abattoir?—Yes.

1778. I should like to know whether the Corporation of Belfast have got power now to insist on all animals being slaughtered in public slaughter-houses?—No, we cannot compel it. This meat which is killed outside can be brought in; we must take the meat if it is brought in, but we can prevent their selling it anywhere without its coming to our central market, except in the case of foreign meat, that is an exception; it can be delivered into our city as much as possible without any inspection at the point of entry. There is a clause in one of our Acts recently passed for the Harbour Board, which is quite a separate Board from our Corporation, to insist that all the meat coming through the Harbour Commissioners must come in without inspection at the harbour. We can seize it outside their ground, but we cannot interfere with the foreign meat coming in until it gets into our city, as it were, crosses the margin; then we can inspect it. You see what we wish is, to have all the slaughter-houses combined in one, and no others, but the one public slaughter-house, as in Germany and in France. The method of dealing with the question in Berlin and in Paris is a lesson to us all.

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Sir John Stirling-Maxwell—continued.

1779. But that arrangement if made would go a long way to meet your difficulty?—Yes.

1780. Then might I just ask you this. You do not like the plan in the Bill of having the compensation put on the rates?—No.

1781. May I ask whether if that were the source from which the compensation had to come, you would rather have this Bill or not have it?—I would not have it if the compensation were put on the local rates.

1782. You would not have the Bill as it stands?—No, if it is on the local rates. I am here as the representative of the Corporation, who have gone into the matter very carefully, and we are strongly advised that it would not do to be on the rates. It would be paying for cattle which were not locally bred and reared, and making Belfast the dumping ground of all the diseased cattle which the north of Ireland brought us; which would be very hard upon us.

Dr. Hutchinson.

1783. You are a very strong advocate, I see, of the payment of full compensation out of Imperial funds for these cases?—Yes, provided that you follow certain conditions.

1784. Now we come to your experience. In Belfast in 10 years you have killed 202,000 beasts, I see?—Yes.

1785. Taking those beasts at an average of 16*l.* a piece, that comes up to 3,238,640*l.* of beasts sold during the last ten years in Belfast?—Yes.

1786. And your experience from that is, that the whole loss which falls upon the butchers is a-half per cent.?—Yes.

1787. And another fact which you have stated to us is, that nearly all the animals, at any rate with regard to the man you mentioned as being ruined in the trade, were cows?—Yes.

1788. And you take into consideration, of course, that this disease is much more prevalent in cows which are shut up?—Yes, and among milking cows especially; that is well known.

1789. Then another great strong point of yours was, that there were three or four men absolutely ruined by this want of compensation?—Yes.

1790. These men were all men, I take it, who dealt in this sort of old milk cow?—One did; two did not—Numbers 1 and 2 did not.

1791. But all those animals which were slaughtered, according to you, were cows?—Yes.

1792. So that, if it ruined them I think we may take it that they were mostly dealers in cows?—Yes.

1793. One of the two you mentioned as a dealer in cows of a price between 5*l.* and 10*l.* a piece?—Yes.

1794. What might be called wasters?—Yes.

1795. Do you think it is fair to suppose that if a man goes in for that sort of business and buys these 5*l.* old milk cows, he does not know the risk he is running?—Sometimes a cow may

Dr. Hutchinson—continued.

be bought in a fair for 5*l.* or 6*l.* when it is really worth more.

1796. That is not the question. I am talking about the general question of a man dealing in cows for which he gives 5*l.* to 10*l.* Is that man to be compensated when he knows the risk he is running?—No, he is not; but I expressly mentioned in my evidence that I would not give any compensation for an animal under 8*l.* in value.

1797. But you brought these cases forward as cases of hardship under the present law?—I presume that you wanted information on the working in our city, and I only acted on my instructions.

1798. It is instructive to us to find that the men who get ruined in the trade are the men who go in for £5 cows?—Yes, but the first and second were respectable butchers.

1799. But all the animals killed were cows?—Yes.

1800. I do not know whether you have noticed in the papers in the last day or two an account of the amount of unsound food condemned in Stepney alone. In Stepney alone during the last year 87½ barrels of apples, 2,772 crates of bananas, 4½ cwt. of cheese, 10,084 tins of assorted fruit, 1 cwt. of mutton, 27 barrels, 25,161 tins, and 48 cases of pine apples, 1,402 bags of potatoes, 33 cases and 12,389 tins of sardines, 338 cases and 58,135 tins of salmon, vast quantities of walnuts, tongue, tomato purée, sugar, sausage, pears, onions, cauliflower, brawn, beef, and other edibles, were also destroyed, amounting altogether to 488 tons of unsound food in Stepney alone. Do you propose that they should be compensated for out of public funds?—I did not discuss that question. I am discussing the tuberculosis question.

1801. And compensation to butchers?—But they do not deal in bananas and pears; they deal in carcases.

1802. My point is that we are considering now the giving of compensation to butchers, are we not?—Yes.

1803. Because some of their meat is found unfit for human food through tuberculosis?—But the two cases are not parallel, if you will pardon me. In the one case they can see a bad banana or a rotten pear; but you cannot see the tuberculosis in the peritoneum or pleura of the cow after post-mortem examination.

1804. You suggest then that all those 488 tons of unsound food taken by the medical officer of health are quite different from the unsound meat that you would condemn in Belfast?—Yes, the conditions are totally different.

1805. Do you suggest that all these men have bought all these tons of unsound food knowing them to be unsound?—I could not go into that.

1806. They buy these things in foreign parts and take their chance?—I could scarcely answer that question. I would not care to compensate persons if they did the thing deliberately and meant to deceive us.

1807. We do not propose to compensate a
butcher

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Dr. Hutchinson—continued.

butcher who does it knowing that he is doing it; that is fraud. It is the man who does not know what he is doing whom it is proposed to compensate. These men in Stepney were not brought up for fraud, and in the same way a man would not be brought up for fraud if he bought a 5*l.* cow; but do you mean to say that a man who buys a cow worth 5*l.* does not run a greater risk of having unsound food than a man who buys cases of sardines?—But with sardines you get a guarantee, and it is not so easy to get a guarantee in the case of cattle.

Dr. Farquharson.

1808. Is it not a fact that at least 90 per cent. of the ordinary cows in dairies are affected by tuberculosis?—No, I do not consider that the percentage is as high as that.

1809. The Royal herd was inspected some time ago, which probably would live under fairly good sanitary conditions, and was found to be affected at a rate of more than 95 per cent.?—That is true; but you must remember that the better bred the cow the more liable it is to tuberculous disease.

1810. That being so, then, if a butcher buys a cow, he must know perfectly well that that cow is liable up to 90 per cent. to be affected by tuberculosis?—No; they do not possess so much scientific knowledge as that.

1811. It is not scientific knowledge. They know as a general principle that 90 per cent. of all the inferior class of dairy cows are affected with tuberculosis, and that being so, they must know that when they buy a cow they are running a great risk. Do you think it is fair under those conditions to give compensation to a man who is buying a bad beast with his eyes wide open?—We do not propose that at all; it is when he buys an apparently good beast and does not know that it is tuberculous that we propose to give him compensation.

1812. But it has just been brought out in your evidence that all these animals in Belfast were cows?—Yes.

1813. And 95 per cent. of cows are known from statistics to be affected with tuberculosis. Is it not the case then that a butcher is buying presumably a diseased animal with his eyes wide open? Why is he to get compensation?—I would not give him compensation under those circumstances; but then our reasoning is that many of them do not know it.

1814. Of course, they do not know whether an individual beast is actually diseased or not, but they must know from statistics that there are 90 chances to 10 in favour of the animal having tuberculosis?—But a butcher does not study statistics; he does not reason by statistics.

1815. It is more than 90 per cent. I think; it is 95 per cent. Now a question about infection. You draw an analogy between the contagion of tuberculosis and that of pleuro-pneumonia; but

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

surely they are on very different planes?—The contagion in each case is due to a bacillus.

1816. Has a bacillus being discovered for pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe it has.

1817. But at all events the two things are entirely different, in this way: that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease spread by contact with a diseased animal, and in the other case it is spread by a bacillus which may be lurking in the udder?—The tuberculosis is there; it comes from outside the cow. And the effect of each disease is to render the animal unfit for human food. I say that there is an analogy. In the one case the person is compensated according to the schedule, and in the other he is not. Why should he not be?

1818. To carry it one step further, is the meat of a tuberculous animal unfit for human food?—Yes, it is.

1819. I daresay you have read carefully the report of the Departmental Committee on Tuberculosis and Pleuro-Pneumonia, which found, after a very large range of experiments, that a properly cooked piece of tuberculous meat cannot transmit tuberculosis?—But supposing it is not properly cooked—and many people eat it when it is not—I say that we should not allow people to run that risk, and we should have meat so good in our city that they can go and buy it in any shop and be perfectly sure that it is free from disease.

1820. My reading of the evidence is that even in an uncooked piece of meat there is no evidence that the tuberculosis bacillus is ever found in the muscular tissue?—I think I must differ from you there. The bacillus is in the lymphatic system, and the lymph vessels go through the muscles. The lymphatic vessels permeate the muscles, and the lymphatic glands are placed in certain muscles. The lymphatic system conveys the tuberculosis bacillus through the body chiefly; and hence I would consider it exceedingly dangerous to take any flesh meat and use it improperly cooked from a tuberculous animal.

1821. Your view is that the farmer whose byre is in an unsanitary condition should get no compensation?—In the first instance; but I qualify that by saying that he must know how to keep his byre satisfactory; he must be taught how to do that.

1822. He is not responsible for the structural defects of his byre; that is the landlord?—He should be. If you had bought your own farm under the Land Acts in Ireland you are absolute owner of it and you are responsible; and we are trying to get every man to own his own land in Ireland.

1823. Ireland is not the only country in the world?—But I happen to represent the north of Ireland, and I am dealing with my own city and district, and I wish to keep it well forward as a place where you can buy meat and have it absolutely free from tuberculosis.

Captain Ellice.

1824. Were all the carcasses that you have destroyed destroyed on account of tuberculosis?

—Yes.

July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Captain *Ellice*—continued.

—Yes, I have given the Committee only those; I did not mention others.

1825. You do destroy other cattle as well?—Yes, for milk fever and other diseases, and fluke in the liver; but I have not troubled the Committee with any of those cases.

1826. You do not suggest that butchers should be compensated for any other disease?—No, I did not go into that question at all.

Mr. *Kilbride*.

1827. I think you told us that you were in favour of compensation entirely out of Imperial funds?—Yes.

1828. That is because the cattle which you kill in Belfast come from different parts of Ireland?—Yes.

1829. Can you tell us how many cattle killed in Belfast in 12 months are bought in Dublin Market and outside your own city?—I could not say.

1830. Is it not within your knowledge, as a matter of fact, that at certain seasons of the year beef is extremely scarce, not alone in Belfast and the neighbourhood, but all over Ulster, and that at that particular time the butchers of Belfast buy their meat very largely in the Dublin Cattle Market?—That is true; we have some very large dealers—I am not prepared to give you the number, but some of the best butchers in the city buy their meat from Dublin.

1831. And it is because that meat which is bought in Dublin probably comes from further south than Dublin, that you think it would be most unfair to the people of Belfast to be taxed for it?—Yes, most certainly.

1832. You say that you are not in favour of compensation for any animals under 8*l.* in value?—Yes.

1833. How do you arrive at that figure of £8?—Because we find that cattle under that price are more likely to be affected with tuberculosis than cows above that price. We find also that a certain class of butchers, such as the third case I have mentioned, would make a large profit by dealing that way; so the Corporation wish to stamp it out absolutely.

1834. Do you think it would be more effectual to have a maximum value of 8*l.*, that is to say, that there should be no compensation for a beast worth less than 8*l.*; or would you think that a standard of quality of the beef would be a better preventive?—I would apply both tests. I am only giving 8*l.* as the value which has been found a good working basis in West Hartlepool. Perhaps you are aware that they have found it to work well there, and West Hartlepool is a very well managed city.

1835. Is it 8*l.* there?—Yes, and in Newcastle, too. There was an insurance society commenced in Newcastle in 1892, and since that date 22,764 animals have been insured, of which only eight

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

have been surrendered. The total amount paid in compensation has been 70*l.*, thus leaving no less a sum than 827*l.* 12*s.* 9*d.* (over 90 per cent. of the sums received) to be redistributed among the 40 members. The explanation of the small number of seizures in this case is the fact that most of the animals insured were of a good class, and no compensation is given for an animal costing less than 8*l.* In West Hartlepool the insurance society was formed in 1891 with a membership of 40. The premium charged is 1*s.* for a cow and 6*d.* for a bullock. In the course of six years 52 claims have been paid, amounting to 440*l.* 9*s.*, and the system has worked very satisfactorily, until of late some members who had had no seizures objected to paying money to compensate others who had. Two-thirds of the value of the beast is given in compensation for seizure. The number of seizures for tuberculosis (and of payment of compensation is limited to this disease) has been gradually increasing, the numbers being 4 in 1891 and 1892, 11 in 1893, 10 in 1894, 5 in 1895, and 15 in 1896.

Chairman.

1836. What are you reading from?—I am reading from a very interesting book on Cattle Tuberculosis, by Legge and Sessions. I use it with my students of the Sanitary Science Class, Queen's College, Belfast.

1837. I gather that in some part of that book there is a recommendation of the insurance societies of West Hartlepool and Newcastle?—Yes, provided that there is the same care exercised as in Germany; that is to say, that there is a thorough system of inspection and only public abattoirs. They put the two conditions one with the other, but not separate. Had we a system of inspection as accurate and as thorough as is carried out in Berlin and Paris, then insurance would meet the case; but that would not meet the case in Belfast, and I am speaking of our present needs. In Berlin and Paris that system, after many years of scientific investigation, has brought them to the highest perfection. We are far behind that, and in justice to these butchers I would urge that now and immediately they should get this compensation.

Mr. *Kilbride*.

1838. You have told the Committee that you would be in favour of the question of the quality of the meat being taken into consideration as well as the total value of the carcass?—Yes.

1839. Supposing that good beef is worth 3*l.* per cwt. where would you draw the line. Would you say that for any cow-beef worth less than 40*s.* when top beef was worth 3*l.*, there should be no compensation?—Anything from 40*s.* to 80*s.* per cwt. should be compensated, but not under that; that I think is the proportion.

1840. Were

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

1840. Were all those cows which have been found to be affected in Belfast the property of dairymen for the purpose of supplying Belfast with milk, or did these cows come from outside Belfast?—Chiefly from the county Antrim, Down, and Cavan, not from Belfast alone.

1841. Could you say, when cows are found affected by tuberculosis, that it is extremely likely, in fact, a great deal more than probable, that cows fed by a dairyman in the city for the purpose of supplying the city with milk, are generally found to have a higher percentage of tuberculosis than the cows of country farmers?—Yes, I understand that it is so.

1842. I want to know then from you whether it is the cows of country farmers which are brought in and killed in Belfast or the cows of the dairymen, who generally sell their cows, as we know, twice a year in the months of May and June, and again in the months of November and December, which are most affected; is it not the cows which are fed in your own city?—It is as a general rule those of the city; but these individual cases which I have given to the Committee were from neighbouring counties. In answer to your second question, I know that dairy-fed cattle fed on improper food in the city are more liable to tuberculosis.

1843. But you do not surely want to leave the Committee under the impression that a higher percentage of farmer's cows from county Down, Antrim, and Cavan, and I think you said as far as Longford, are diseased than of the cows fed in the City of Belfast?—The individual cases which I have mentioned were cows brought from the neighbouring counties. I answered your second question by saying that where a cow is in a badly-constructed byre, with insufficient ventilation, where the food is improper, no matter where that cow is she is more liable to be attacked by tuberculosis than a cow under more hygienic conditions.

1844. As a matter of fact are not the farmers' cows, at least for six months of the year, altogether outside the byres, and is it not the case in many instances even during the winter time, that it is very little time they spend in the byres?—Yes.

1845. Therefore, according to yourself, the cattle fed by dairymen inside the city, which are never outside the byre, must, from their condition be much more affected than the cattle of country farmers. You say that you are in favour altogether of Imperial compensation?—Yes.

1846. Therefore you would be opposed to the city paying anything?—Anything more than it pays now. You are aware that according to the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, which I mentioned. In our poor law valuation, we are taxed for Imperial purposes. Why should we not pay the compensation out of that very fund from which we are already paying into. The Chief Secretary has only to give a certificate that such and such a cow has had pleuro-pneumonia, and it is paid for. Why should not the same system

Mr. Kilbride—continued.

be applied to tuberculosis in cattle? It is not a favour we require; we actually have the money subscribed according to our valuation for the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1894. Out of that money we have already provided, through our Poor Law Guardians this compensation should be given. That is my point.

1847. Would you give full compensation?—There is a Schedule arranged in this Act which is very just, that is in this Compensation Clause Chapter 57 of 1894, which provides that no compensation is given beyond 30*l.*, and under certain other conditions. If a cow is perfectly healthy and is in contact with a diseased one, this healthy cow originally if it is valued at 40*l.* can be paid full compensation for, but the diseased one cannot exceed 30*l.* I think I am right in my synopsis of those compensation clauses.

1848. Supposing that a cow is found to be suffering from tuberculosis in Belfast when it is killed, and the butcher pays 12*l.* for the cow, which I see is the average price, would you give the butcher 12*l.*?—Yes? if he bought that animal in good faith and did not know she was affected with tuberculosis, I certainly say he should have it. There are certain limitations in the Act of Parliament under which he should lose the 12*l.*

Mr. Field.

1849. I think you said that the inspection in Belfast was very strict?—Yes.

1850. Has it always been very strict?—No, it was not at first.

1851. Do you think that the system of inspection that you have at Belfast at the present time, goes beyond the necessity of protecting the public health?—No.

1852. Are you of opinion that your system of inspection within the limits of Belfast city puts a great deal of the trade of slaughtering outside the city?—Yes.

1853. That is to say, you wish to convey to the Committee that under the existing circumstances, the outside slaughter-houses, which are not subject to inspection, are getting more business, and less business comes to the public abattoir?—Yes.

1854. In your view as a citizen of Belfast, is that a disastrous state of things?—Yes, it is most lamentable.

1855. And in addition, it increases the danger of consumption of diseased meat, because cattle which would not be passed in your abattoir are killed in these outside slaughter-houses?—Yes.

1856. There are a few points which have not yet been enquired into by other members of the Committee, who have not the same technical knowledge that I have. In the first place is it the finer parts of these cattle which are generally brought into the city, the ribs and sirloins?—Yes.

1857. Which you have not the same facility, of course, for examining?—No.

1858. You do not see the offal of these animals under any circumstances?—No.

1859. In

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

1859. In your opinion is the examination of the offal very desirable?—It is absolutely essential, if the inspection is to be complete.

1860. Are you aware that a deputation of butchers went to the Corporation of Belfast on this question?—Yes.

1861. What was the result of that deputation?—We said that we could only carry out the instructions of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis, those regulations.

1862. And you have carried out those regulations?—Yes, we have carried them out most strictly.

1863. That is to say, you do not confiscate cattle except in cases of generalised tuberculosis; where it is only localised you do not confiscate them?—That is so; we take the affected parts away and leave the rest of the carcase.

1864. Is it your habit, then when you destroy a carcase, to give the butcher a certain amount for offal and to burn the rest of the carcase?—No; our rule is this: Supposing the entire carcase is seized, we get a magistrate's order, and it is sent away to the destructor. A man owns this destructor as his own private property; we send one of our inspectors with each carcase to see that it is destroyed. He gives to the Master Butchers' Protection Society 60*l.* a year, and that 60*l.* is all which the butchers get for the entire of those seizures.

1865. How many seizures?—In 1903 there were 116; in the year before, 1902, 159; in 1901 there were 150; and in 1900, 183.

1866. Does it not seem rather a curious arrangement to have a fixed sum whether the number of carcasses be small or great?—It is not our arrangement; it is the arrangement between this gentleman and the butcher. We have nothing to do with it as the City Corporation.

1867. You are aware that a memorial from the Belfast Butchers' Protection Association was sent to Sir Horace Plunkett, Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in 1901?—Yes.

1868. Do you know anything about that?—It happened to be on the deputation; I went as one of the deputation.

1869. You gave him a list of cattle confiscated, I think, from 1895 to 1900—being 3,000*l.* worth?—Yes; that list was supplied by the Master Butchers' Protection Association.

1870. They lost 3,000*l.* any way from the 17th February, 1896, to the 8th April, 1901—Something less than six years?—Yes; they reported so to us. This is, of course, not official from the Belfast City Corporation; it is simply from the Master Butchers' Protection Association.

1871. I am not taking it from the Belfast Corporation. There are two sides to this question; there is the Corporation's side and the butchers' side. I do not pretend or presume to speak for the Corporation; I am speaking for my fellow traders. These men have a system of mutual insurance?—Yes.

0.16.

Mr. Field—continued.

1872. And they have found that they could not work to it pay?—Yes.

1873. I have been in Belfast both in the market and the abattoir; therefore I speak to a certain extent with knowledge. Do I rightly understand you to say that the two sale yards work this insurance?—Yes.

1874. At 1*s.* each whether for cow or bullock?—Yes.

1875. They made no difference between cows and bullocks?—No.

1876. Did I rightly understand you to say that in Belfast Market, which is a public market, such as the Dublin Cattle Market (although there is no comparison between the two) there is no system of insurance?—No, not any.

1877. So that you only have a partial system of insurance?—Yes.

1878. And that partial system of insurance has not been found to answer?—No.

1879. The deputation submitted these points which you have submitted to the Committee already, that is under certain sections of the Act of 1894, to the Department of Agriculture?—Yes.

1880. Being of opinion that the Department of Agriculture might help them?—Yes.

1881. But the Department of Agriculture has done nothing to help them?—No, it has done nothing to help them.

1882. The matter was left in *statu quo*?—Yes.

1883. You spoke of Paris and Berlin. I have been in both places. I have been in Budapest and all over the Continent—in Vienna. On the Continent there is a different system, there is a particular system of inspection, and a certain amount of compensation is given, and the carcasses of animals beyond a certain degree are sterilized and sold. Would you recommend the adoption of some such system in this country?—Yes, provided that we carried out the whole of their conditions.

1884. Provided that we had public abattoirs?—Yes. And I would quite agree, as in the Berlin Cattle Insurance Association, to give insurance under these conditions: "(1) The insurance of cattle destined for slaughter belonging to the cattle dealers of Berlin has been founded to protect the owners of cattle, by the payment of a premium, from the great losses to which they are exposed owing to the rigorous measures of the Veterinary Inspectors at the abattoirs. (2) The association is not started for purposes of gain. The premium to be paid, therefore, is regulated every month according to the number of seizures, and published on the first of each month in the abattoir. In February, 1895, this was 8*s.* for a cow, 6*s.* for a bull, and 2*s.* for a bullock or heifer. (3) No person is allowed to insure who does not promise in writing to insure the whole of his cattle coming to the slaughterhouse. (4) Animals cannot be insured which have been injured during transit or have been

M

transferred

7 July 1904.]

Mr. O'NEILL, M.D., J.P.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

transferred as suspicious by the veterinary inspectors to the contagious disease isolation slaughter-house, or are markedly wasted or recognised as diseased by the veterinary inspectors; (5) The compensation paid is the full market price of the animal. If the carcass is not wholly condemned then the price of the portions which are allowed for sale must be deducted; (6) The liability of the society ceases if the animal is not slaughtered within 20 days; (7) The director is justified in refusing the privileges of insurance to those whom he is convinced will cause damage to the office, or to those not acting in good faith." I entirely endorse that state of things.

1885. You think something of that sort ought to be adopted in Belfast?—Yes, absolutely. I would impose those conditions. That would make our food supply in Belfast free from this desperate scourge of tuberculosis; and, secondly, it would do justice to farmers and justice to butchers.

1886. The hon. member on my left wants to know what you mean the Committee to understand by the market value; do you mean the selling value?—Yes.

Dr. Farquharson.

1887. Supposing it was a short-horn bull worth 1,000 guineas?—I mean the meat price or the beef price.

Mr. Field.

1888. Are you aware that in Australia they have a system by which the owners or producers of cattle pay to the auctioneer a certain amount—something like 2 per cent?—I know that there is some arrangement of that kind, but I am not familiar with it; I am more familiar with the Continental system.

1889. Are you of opinion that we are behind the rest of the world in these arrangements?—I think there are some parts of South Africa which are a little farther behind than we are; but compared with anywhere else I think we are about the last.

1890. Are you aware that the Transvaal Government at the present moment authorise the slaughtering of all cattle where it is necessary to get rid of cattle disease, and they have to pay the full amount less the amount realised by the hide?—I believe it is so.

1891. So that you would think we are below South Africa, too?—Not the central part of South Africa; I speak of the central part, the Congo.

1892. Outside the Congo you think that Great Britain and Ireland have the worst system

Mr. Field—continued.

of cattle management in the world?—I would not say that, but they are certainly behind the Continent. I look upon the system in Berlin, Paris, Hamburg, and Bremen, as very much more advantageous.

1893. I think that you said you would give compensation between the limits of 8*l.* and 30*l.*?—Yes.

1894. You understand that it never was proposed in this Bill to protect the dealers in bad meat?—Never.

1895. You were asked about perishable articles, an argument which has been used in this Committee very fully. The class of good cattle which are bought in the sale-yards are bought at full market value?—Yes.

1896. The man who buys it has no means of finding out whether an animal is tuberculous?—No.

1897. Do you think that it is for the general public good that such an animal should be paid for by the public?—Yes.

1898. With regard to perishable articles is it not a fact that meat is a more perishable article than any of those articles which have been mentioned?—No, it is not more perishable than some of those things, but it is perishable.

1899. Especially in this kind of weather?—Yes.

1900. And the man who buys the meat alive has to take the risk, just the same as if he bought one of those articles?—Yes.

1901. One word more and I have done. The risk, as my honourable friend here says, is a great deal more particularly in hot weather, as I very well know?—Yes, it is.

1902. And you are entirely in favour of Imperial compensation?—Yes, as a just and fair means; and we have the means at hand in this Act which I have mentioned—the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1894—with slight modifications to suit the case.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1903. Is it within your knowledge that many buyers have suffered much loss?—I have only given the Committee three instances; there are many more, but I did not wish to weary you. To my own knowledge these are only individual cases to show the nature of it.

1904. Then one more question on compensation. If this compensation was given it would be a greater inducement to put down tuberculosis than the present system?—Yes, infinitely better; but, as I said to the Chairman, I think it is only one link in the chain. The other links are, to stamp out the disease at the inception—that is, the filthy byre and bad feeding and improper water and conditions.

7 July 1904.

MR. ANDREW WATSON, M.R.C.V.S., called; and Examined.

Chairman.

1905. You are Veterinary Inspector for the City of Dublin, I understand?—That is so.

1906. And you are in favour of compensation, I understand?—I am, under certain conditions.

1907. Are you speaking on behalf of the Corporation?—Well, the Corporation have not expressed any definite opinion on the subject.

1908. But your own opinion is in favour of compensation?—Yes, and also the opinion of Sir Charles Cameron, the Medical Officer of Health.

1909. But you would give the compensation under certain conditions, I suppose?—That is so.

1910. What would your conditions be?—I would give compensation under the condition that the butcher who bought the animal in the open market should be a man of good repute.

1911. Who is to settle whether the buyer is a man of good repute?—It ought to be within the knowledge of the veterinary inspector and the other meat inspectors.

1912. So that if the veterinary inspector did not consider the butcher a man of good repute he would get no compensation?—I mean that he should be a man of good repute as regards seeing to the character of the stuff he bought.

1913. If he was a man of good repute you would give him full compensation, would you?—Yes.

1914. Then I see in your proof you suggest that if the beast was seized while in the market and was still the property of the farmer or grazier, there should be only half compensation?—That is so.

1915. But have you any power to seize a live animal in the market on the ground that you consider it to be tuberculous?—Yes.

1916. Under what Act?—Under the Public Health Act, Ireland, if it is exposed in course of preparation for sale.

1917. But a live beast brought into the market is not in course of preparation for sale?—It is exposed for sale and intended for the food of man.

Dr. Farquharson.

1918. Is that a local Dublin Act?—No, it is the Public Health Act, Ireland.

1919. It is not a local Act of the Corporation?—No.

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

1920. Have you ever seized an animal?—No. The course we adopt at present is that on account of the dearth of diagnosing accurately the existence of tuberculosis, we tell the owner the opinion that we have, and we suggest to him that he should have the animal removed to our abattoir and slaughtered; and then if upon the post-mortem it turns out to be tuberculosis we confiscate the carcase. It depends also, of course, upon the extent of the tuberculosis. If it turns out that our diagnosis was in error and the carcase is otherwise healthy, we let it go.

1921. Do you compensate the man whose animal you seize?—We do not seize it. We suggest it to him.

1922. But you say you have the power?—Yes. Up to the present time we have not seized it, but where it is intended for the food of man, and is exposed in the market and intended for the food of man we have power to do so. But there is a very great difficulty about a definite diagnosis of the disease.

1923. And in any case you have never confiscated a live animal in the market?—No.

1924. You are in favour of compensation on the ground that you think it just?—Yes.

1925. And also on the ground that it would stimulate owners to report cases?—Yes.

1926. You corroborate the last witness in that respect?—Yes.

1927. As to your own experience, have you any idea how many cattle were slaughtered in Dublin in the year 1900?—I have not got a return of the number slaughtered in Dublin.

1928. What sort of number would be slaughtered, do you suppose?—We have one abattoir and then we have 61 slaughter-houses. In the abattoir the average number slaughtered in the week would be about 190. There is really no record of the number killed outside.

1929. Could you tell the Committee, within a few thousands, what number of cattle would be slaughtered in Dublin in a year; would there be 10,000? How many did you seize in the year 1900?—It was in the first portion of that year that I came into office. We seized two.

1930. There were two seizures?—There were two seizures outside. I am only talking now of seizures outside the abattoir.

1931. Can you give us the figures for the seizures in the abattoir?—No, I have not got them for that year, I have them for the year 1903.

1932. That will do; we will come to the year 1903. First of all outside the abattoir in 1901 how many seizures were there?—We had 23 seizures.

M 2

1933. How

7 July 1904.]

Mr. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S.

[Continued.]

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

1933. How many of those were tuberculous?
—Two of them were tuberculous.

1934. Only two?—Only two.

1935. Were they beasts belonging to breeders of good repute?—No.

1936. In 1902 how many seizures were there outside the abattoir?—In 1902 we had 15 seizures.

1937. How many of them were tuberculous?
—Six.

1938. And did they belong to men of good repute?—No.

1939. So that the Act, if passed with the condition which you suggest, would not have been in operation in either of those years?—No.

1940. In the year 1903 how many seizures were there outside the abattoir?—In 1903 we had 11 seizures.

1941. How many of those were tuberculous?
—Two out of the 11.

1942. Did those beasts belong to men of good character?—Yes, to men of very good character.

1943. And this year how many seizures have you had outside the abattoir?—We have only had two.

1944. Were either of those animals tuberculous?—Neither of them.

1945. Could you give us the figures for the abattoir?—We slaughter approximately 190 beasts a week.

1946. And would you tell us how many are seized?—That is for the year 1903. In 1903 the seizures in the abattoir were 57 for tuberculosis.

1947. Fifty-seven out of 10,000, I gather. 190 per week you said?—Yes.

1948. That is 57 out of about 10,000?—Yes.

1949. Were those 57 totally condemned?—Yes, those were all condemned.

1950. All totally condemned?—Yes, those are total condemnations.

1951. But 57 was the whole number that was seized, I understand?—Yes.

1952. Did you not seize any and partly destroy them?—I have not got a record I am afraid of the numbers where there would be local tuberculosis, and we allowed the carcass to go after removing the part affected.

1953. But as regards the total seizure, the loss was 57 out of 10,000?—Yes, that is for tuberculosis. We had seven for blackleg, 231 for putrefaction and we had three for actinomycosis.

1954. What is that?—It is vulgarly known as wooden tongue; it is a ray-shaped fungus which attacks usually the lower jaw and the back part of the tongue, and goes right through the whole tongue. It is very contagious.

Mr. Field.

1955. It is an American disease, is it not?—No, it has been described for a great many years.

1956. It is very prevalent in America?—Yes.

Chairman.

1957. Would you compensate the owner of cattle which had blackleg or wooden tongue?—No; because any man who would buy such an animal should know that it was affected by it. That is a disease which is easily diagnosed.

Sir Mark Stewart.

1958. How is it easily diagnosed; you do not see the tongue?—The animal is unable toprehend its food. It is slobbering at the mouth continuously and is unable to feed. All these symptoms are very marked.

Chairman.

1959. And yet the butchers buy them?—And yet they buy them.

1960. And bring them to slaughter?—Yes, we only condemn them in that case; and it is considered to meet the ends of justice by confiscation of the parts affected.

1961. Do you know if those diseases would injure man?—Yes, actinomycosis has been frequently described in the human being.

Mr. Loyd.

1962. You say that the live animal is, according to the law in force in Dublin, exposed for food?—Exposed for sale and intended for the food of man.

1963. Those are the words in the Act?—Yes.

1964. Is that the General Public Health Act (Ireland)?—Yes.

1965. Do you know whether it is drawn from the English Act?—I could not say.

1966. You merely look at the animal for the purpose of seeing whether you are entitled to seize it; that is how you become cognisant of the fact that it is technically exposed for the food of man?—Yes.

1967. And does that same consideration enable the magistrate to deal with it where you can take it before him?—Yes.

1968. Is the onus of proof upon the owner of the beast to show that it was not intended for the food of man?—That is where the onus lies, he has to prove the contrary.

Sir Edward Strachey.

1969. Out of 10,000 animals you say that 57 were condemned?—Yes.

1970. Can you tell me what was the value of those ten beasts?—The valuation, I should say, would run from 15*l.* to 20*l.*

1971. Many of them are very good beasts?—They are all more or less well-nourished carcasses.

1972. None of them were wasters?—No.

Captain Ellice.

1973. Have you destroyed any carcasses for septicæmia

7 July 1904.]

MR. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S.

[Continued.]

Captain *Ellice*—continued.

septicæmia during the year?—We have destroyed nine for septic diseases during last year.

1974. You do not suggest that butchers should be compensated for them?—Certainly not.

1975. Is that a disease which is easily discovered in the carcass?—In the majority of the cases it arises from metritis—inflammation of the womb—and they should see the discharge coming from the womb.

1976. Is that a very infectious disease?—It is very infectious—very deadly.

Dr. *Farquharson*.

1977. I understand that you hold a different opinion from the Corporation of Dublin on the subject of compensation?—I said that the Corporation had expressed no opinion.

1978. They must have an opinion?—As a corporate body they have expressed no opinion. I have said that the Medical Officer of Health, Sir Charles Cameron, agrees with me that there ought to be compensation.

1979. But they must have an opinion, even if they do not express it?—I do not think the question has been put to them.

1980. I did not quite understand whether those two diseases which you describe, blackleg and throat affection, are communicable to man?—Symptomatic anthrax would not be communicable to man.

1981. The ordinary anthrax is?—Yes, but then it is a highly inflammable disease. The carcass undergoes putrefactive changes very rapidly, and the consequence is that ptomaine would develop very rapidly in an animal which had died of blackleg, but actinomycosis is undoubtedly communicable to man.

1982. Do you know of many cases in Dublin of butchers being hard hit pecuniarily by the seizing of tuberculous carcasses?—There are the two cases I mentioned of last year, 1903, both men of very good standing; they were two very good carcasses seized. I know the absolute value of one was 20*l.* and of the other 18*l.* 15*s.* In both of those cases the carcasses were seized and the men were prosecuted; so that they had the publication of the prosecution and the loss of trade arising from that as well as the loss of the carcasses, and all the worry of paying the legal expenses for the defence.

Mr. *Kilbride*.

1983. You have 61 private slaughter-houses in Dublin?—Sixty-one.

1984. Are there more cattle killed in the 61 private slaughter-houses than there are in the abattoir?—Yes; I have not got the number, I am only speaking generally.

1985. You are in favour of doing away with these private slaughter-houses in Dublin?—Strongly; but you cannot do away with them without compensation.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

1986. And you have no law at present that enables you to do away with them?—No.

1987. So that you cannot get rid of the 61 private slaughter-houses?—Unless you buy them out.

1988. They have vested interests?—Yes, they are protected by Acts of Parliament.

1989. Do you think that under existing conditions in Dublin with 61 private slaughter-houses as well as a public abattoir, you can possibly cope with infectious diseases of cattle?—No; you want more inspectors.

1990. Are you in favour of having all the cattle killed, no matter how many inspectors you have, in the public abattoir?—No matter how many inspectors we have we are pressing to do away with the private slaughter-houses and to have all the slaughtering done in the abattoir.

1991. These cattle that were confiscated were cattle bought in the Dublin cattle market?—Yes.

1992. Were they cows?—Yes, the majority would be cows.

1993. But they would be Dublin dairymen's cows?—No, it is an extraordinary thing, but we do not find that a number of dairymen's cows find their way into our abattoir.

1994. Then these cows that were killed there were graziers' cows?—Yes.

1995. Do you think that amongst the Dublin dairymen's cows the percentage of tuberculosis is very much higher than it is with the graziers' cows?—It is higher. It is not as high as it is in other places.

1996. But it is higher than it is with graziers' cows?—Yes.

1997. Do you think that it would be fair for the city of Dublin to pay compensation out of the city rates?—I was told to express no opinion upon that, by Sir Charles Cameron.

1998. Have you any view as to the question where the compensation should come from?—I think it would be fair to distribute it all over the country.

Mr. *Field*.

1999. Is it your experience that tuberculous cases are not very frequent in Dublin?—It is.

2000. Would you say to the Committee from your experience, that we have less tuberculosis in proportion in our cattle probably than they have in England?—I would.

2001. Do you attribute that to the fact that our cattle feeds under more natural conditions, being more in the open air?—All our dairy yards in Dublin are open sheds; the dairies have large yards attached to them. The cows are only in these sheds for six months in the year, and they only keep them for six months. The system adopted in England is to keep the cattle about a year and to put them in calf, and they do not convert them into beef after six months as we do. And there is another point in which we are stronger

7 July 1904.]

Mr. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

stronger, that is, the wholesale slaughter of pleuro-pneumoniacs. That did away with a tremendous amount of tuberculosis and gave us a very clean slate.

2002. Do the Dublin dairymen sell their cows twice a year?—Yes.

2003. You are in favour of compensation by the State?—Yes.

2004. Is it your opinion that the Dublin victuallers steer as clear as they can of having animals which are likely to be confiscated?—I am certain of it.

2005. Are you of opinion that such confiscation would ruin the trade, owing to prosecution and exposure?—Yes, it does, and did.

2006. Have you cases in your mind of such prosecutions practically putting a man out of the trade?—Yes, I know of a case where it killed a man, at least it was alleged to have done so.

2007. From your experience as the veterinary officer of the Corporation, you are of opinion that respectable men in business would not touch these tuberculous animals?—No, they would not, even men in the Dublin market who buy a rather cheap class of article have recently avoided them, and if they want to buy them they must be guaranteed that they are not tuberculous. They have to turn these animals that may not be tuberculous but are poor, and hence there is a doubt about it, out of the market unsold.

2008. They go to Glasgow, I suppose?—Very likely. It is a very common market for them.

2009. You are only in favour of compensation from Imperial funds?—Yes.

2010. And you think that the way matters stand at the present time is an obstacle to the trade?—Yes.

2011. And you are in favour of a man who buys a beast in good faith at the full market price being compensated?—Yes, I am.

Chairman.

2012. I should just like to ask you: do you prosecute in Dublin if a man has not attempted to conceal the fact that the meat he has is tuberculous?—If we find tuberculous meat on his premises, for the very fact of finding it on his premises we are ordered to prosecute; but anyone killing in the abattoir is guaranteed that there will be no prosecution. That is in order to give them the stimulus to go to our abattoir.

2013. You prosecute those who kill in their own slaughter-houses; yet you do not prosecute those who kill in your abattoir?—That is so.

Mr. Loyd.

2014. The Chairman has just followed up where I stopped, and I just want to ask you this. At what point does the owner endeavour to show that the animal is not exposed for food? I suppose that is never done with the live animal, is it; he does not pretend that the animal is not intended for food?—Now they have got to know the words of the Act of Parliament and when we come along to examine the animal the man puts up the plea immediately, "That is not intended for food; that is intended for store," which immediately disarms us.

2015. If it is for store you do not look to the remote time when it will become food. It is only when it is intended for immediate slaughter that you take action?—Yes.

2016. But in point of fact, you have never taken any criminal proceedings against a man when you have discovered that a live animal is affected?—We have not taken any yet.

2017. Would it be reasonable to do so?—No, unless they marked them.

2018. It is only in respect of carcasses that any prosecution ever takes place at all?—That is so.

Dr. Farquharson.

2019. You say that you have got about 65 private slaughter-houses?—Sixty-one.

2020. And you do not approve of them?—No.

2021. Why did you not get a local Act to abolish them, the same as they did in Glasgow?—There was a clause put in a previous Act saying that they must be compensated.

2022. Are you aware that in Glasgow the Corporation have entirely abolished all private slaughter-houses, and have nothing but the public abattoir? Why do you not follow their example?—It might inflict a hardship upon some men. The prices in the slaughter-houses in the city of Dublin have in some cases reached a very high figure.

Mr. Field.

2023. Are you aware that all the bad meat which cannot be sold in Dublin goes to Glasgow, although they have an abattoir?—I do not know that.

2024. You have no personal knowledge of the fact that meat which is unsaleable in Dublin, through the agency of the private slaughter-houses, goes to Glasgow, where it is killed in the abattoir?—No.

Dr. Farquharson.

2025. Are you aware that all the inspectors in Glasgow are trained veterinary surgeons, who are not likely to let bad meat go through?—No.

2026. You

7 July 1904.

MR. JAMES KING, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

2026. You are Veterinary Inspector for the Corporation of London?—That is so.

2027. And have you had very considerable experience in other places?—Yes.

2028. Have you been Veterinary Inspector in Edinburgh and Chief Veterinary Inspector in the City of Manchester before you came to London?—Yes.

2029. And now you are in charge of the Metropolitan Cattle Market, Islington?—Yes.

2030. As to the cattle: is it your opinion that the existence of tuberculosis in British cattle is the principal reason of the growing demand for foreign meat?—That is my opinion.

2031. Not because the foreign meat is cheaper?—Foreign meat is not much cheaper, because English meat has to compete with the foreign meat, which turns out just as good as our own produce.

2032. Is it your experience that there is much more tuberculosis in cows than in bullocks?—Yes.

2033. Is the competition with foreign meat in British bullocks, or in British cows?—In both.

2034. Is there a large import of cows for food from abroad?—Not to London.

2035. So that the bulk of the foreign meat sent in is in the meat of bullocks or of heifers?—You have also to compete with Danish meat—Danish cows.

2036. Is there a large import of cows for food from Denmark?—Not cows, but carcasses of cows.

2037. You say that the great loss is driving people out of the home meat market?—That is my opinion.

2038. And will you give us figures to show how much that loss is?—Yes.

2039. Do you know the opinion of the Corporation on this matter?—As regards compensation, do you mean?

2040. Yes?—That compensation ought to be given to butchers who buy in good faith, but not to those who buy cows at speculative prices; that is, prices about 7*l.* and under.

2041. Have they passed a resolution to that effect?—Those are my instructions from my chairman. But that that compensation should not be paid by local authorities.

2042. But it should be paid by the State, I suppose?—That is so.

2043. You have made post-mortem examinations with a view of discovering the percentage of cattle affected by tuberculosis?—I have done so.

2044. You examined 1,738 animals?—Yes.

2045. How were the animals selected?—The animals passed through the Metropolitan Cattle Market for slaughter?—They were sent in in the ordinary way for sale in the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

Chairman—continued.

2046. Then I suppose there are an enormous amount of animals sent in for sale?—About 1,500 a week.

2047. How did you select the 1,738 for post-mortem?—I selected those purchased by the tenants who slaughter at the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

2048. In one week?—No; this extends over a considerable time.

2049. But surely over that considerable time the tenants purchased a great many more than 1,738?—Yes, but this was a very important examination, and I had only to take two places.

2050. I want to get at whether this was a fair sample of the cattle coming in?—Yes, I rejected anyone that I thought showed the slightest signs of tuberculosis.

2051. And these were a fair sample taken out of the purchases of two men; is that so?—I examined all that certain men purchased.

2052. I should suggest that you put in this table, which is in your proof; but can you summarise it in any way?—I shall show the number of cows I examined. Of course you notice that cows are in excess of other animals. The reason is that I had more cows slaughtered where I made the post-mortem examinations. I had 500 cows, of which I found 266 free from tuberculosis, and I found 234 more or less affected by the disease.

2053. That is to say, 48·8 per cent. of the cows had it?—Yes.

2054. As to bulls, you examined 113?—I found 93 sound and 20 showing lesions and disease in one or other of the organs.

2055. 17·17 per cent. affected, that is?—Yes.

2056. Of oxen there were 131 examined and 11·45 per cent. were affected; is that right?—Yes, that is so.

2057. Of calves, 941 were examined and 1·27 per cent. were affected?—That is so.

2058. Of heifers, 53 were examined, and 20·75 per cent. were affected?—Yes.

2059. So that shows surely that the greater part of the disease is in cows?—That is so; that is recognised.

2060. Of those 234 cows that you found tuberculous, how many did you destroy?—35, 7 per cent.

2061. 35 out of 500?—Yes.

2062. Carcasses partly destroyed, 32?—That is so.

2063. So that only 67 out of the whole 500 cows were destroyed either wholly or partially?—That is so; that is referring to beef only, not the viscera.

2064. Then you have another table, which you can perhaps hand in, as to the weights and values of the meat and viscera destroyed?—Yes.

2065. That

7 July 1904.]

Mr. KING.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

2065. That is with respect to the animals on your first table, I suppose?—That is so.

2066. Were they all destroyed for tuberculosis?—All in this table, yes.

2067. The table which you have here shows a loss of 537*l.* 13*s.* for destruction?—That is so.

2068. That is on the 1,738 animals?—Yes.

2069. What have you put as the average value of those animals?—Of course you have to separate those figures, because I include here calves. If you take the cattle I should average them at about 15*l.* apiece.

2070. You have not given here your estimated total value of animals on which there was this loss?—I have taken those cows as being over the value for which one would ask compensation; that is, over 8*l.*

2071. But could you work out and give us some idea?—You can put the whole cattle down—cows, say, 12*l.*: the others, the bulls, heifers and oxen, at 18*l.* average value.

2072. And how about the calves?—About 4*l.* apiece. They were all good calves. I may tell you that all the calves here were selected by the Local Government Board for the purpose of obtaining lymph, and their value is about 4*l.*, they are really stirks.

2073. It would be interesting to know how this process of selection of these animals took place. How did they come to be all calves that were selected by the Local Government Board?—I give you the figures as being correct, because a post-mortem examination was made by two veterinary surgeons; they are all of equal value.

2074. Perhaps you mean this, that the two places where you got these animals from for post-mortem examination were the very places where the Local Government Board got their calves?—Those calves are supplied by one of the tenants at the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and they are sent, I understand, to Chelsea, and after being used for the purposes of obtaining calf lymph and have recovered are slaughtered at the Metropolitan Cattle Market, where post-mortems are made in order to ascertain their freedom from tuberculosis.

2075. Then as to the general question what number of beasts are slaughtered at the Metropolitan Cattle Market, can you give us the number for the year 1901?—In the year 1901 we had 18,932 cattle, 8,781 calves, 100,945 sheep and 39,279 pigs; making a total of 167,939.

2076. How many of those were found unfit for human food?—947 totally unfit, and 275 partially.

2077. Of those 947 totally unfit, I see that 750 were cows?—That is the number.

2078. And of those partly destroyed, out of 275 no less than 258 were cows?—Yes.

2079. You say there were altogether 1,222 either wholly or partly destroyed; how many of those were destroyed for tuberculosis?—750 were destroyed owing to their being affected with tuberculosis.

2080. That left 472 destroyed for other reasons?—That is so.

2081. What were the other reasons?—

Chairman—continued.

Actinomycosis, swine fever, and various diseases which affect cattle.

2082. Would you compensate in those cases?—No, I would not.

2083. Only in cases of tuberculosis?—Only in cases of tuberculosis, owing to the great difficulty in recognising the disease during life.

2084. Then the result is, that 750 animals were destroyed for tuberculosis out of 167,939?—That is so.

2085. Now in 1903 what were the numbers?—In 1903 there were 13,639 cattle, 6,224 calves, 88,571 sheep, and 36,385 pigs: making a total number of animals slaughtered during that year of 144,819.

2086. Of which there were wholly destroyed 666?—That is so.

2087. Of which 369 were cows?—Yes.

2088. And 203 were pigs?—That is right.

2089. The number partly destroyed was 255, of which 228 were cows?—Yes.

2090. The total of wholly or partially destroyed being 921?—Yes.

2091. How many of the 921 were destroyed for tuberculosis?—558.

2092. Out of 144,819?—That is right.

2093. That I work out to be one in every 259?—That is about it.

2094. Now there is a diminution in the number of animals slaughtered at your market?—Yes.

2095. To what do you attribute that diminution?—To the presence of tuberculosis amongst our cattle.

2096. And to your close inspection?—Yes.

2097. You support that by pointing out that there has been an increase in the number of foreign cattle landed?—Yes, the figures show that.

2098. You might just give the Committee the number of beasts landed in 1901 and 1903?—In London during 1901 there were 154,881 cattle landed and slaughtered at Deptford, and of sheep 68,177, making a total of animals at the wharf for the year, 223,058.

2099. And in 1903?—In 1903 there were 182,695 cattle, three calves, and 120,730 sheep.

2100. That is a total of 303,428?—That is so.

2101. Of those how many were partly or wholly destroyed for tuberculosis?—In 1901 two were totally destroyed; but I may here state that a record was not kept up to that time, and this would only go from September to the end of the year; during that time you could not take it as being only two out of 154,881—that would hardly be fair. That is all we have a record of. In addition you have, of course, four partially condemned.

2102. Two totally destroyed and four with diseased organs destroyed, that is six out of 154,881 beasts, leaving out sheep. Then in 1903, are the figures correct for that?—Yes.

2103. Out of 182,695 beasts were there only seven partly destroyed?—Seven totally destroyed.

2104. One partly destroyed, and 58 with organs affected?—That is so, and the carcass found to be sound.

2105. Now

7 July 1904.]

Mr. KING.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

2105. Now let me take you to pigs. You have heard great complaints from salesmen as regards the seizure of pigs for tuberculosis, have you not?—Yes, that is so.

2106. And you think they are sending their pigs to other markets?—I know that.

2107. Have you made a close inspection of the amount of loss with regard to pigs during the first three months of this year?—Yes, I have, at the request of the Market Committee.

2108. What did you find to be, during that period, the number of pigs slaughtered at the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—15,225.

2109. Of which how many were found to be subject to tuberculosis?—75, or about one-half per cent.

2110. About one in every 200?—Yes.

2111. What would be the value of those pigs?—They were valued at about 50s. apiece. The pigs weighed from eight to 60 stone, but taking them all round, 50s. would be a fair value.

2112. Which makes a loss on the number killed of how much?—187l. 10s. for the three months.

2113. As to the value of those pigs, putting them at 50s., I make them worth 38,062l.?—Yes.

2114. Out of that the loss was less than 10s. per 100l.?—Yes, but that loss had to be borne by three tenants.

2115. But they had had this number of pigs?—Yes, but I assure you that pigs are bought so close now that a man will kill a pig to get 6d.; he will be very pleased to kill all the pigs he has got to get 6d. a head in the London market.

2116. The inspectors act on the report of Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission?—Yes.

2117. Have you heard that much complained of as regards pigs?—Yes.

2118. You think it is too rigorous as regards pigs?—I do now with our present knowledge.

2119. It is also much more difficult, I understand, to diagnose the disease in pigs before slaughter than it is even in cattle?—It is almost impossible to diagnose it in pigs during life, unless they have enlarged glands and throats.

2120. You can hardly tell it without cutting into the glands, I gather?—After slaughter? Yes.

2121. Have you found yourself that in about 30 per cent. of the pigs condemned, the disease was only in the glands, and that there were no lesions in the other parts of the body?—Yes.

2122. So that your own personal view with your experience of many years is, that Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission was too hard upon the pig?—Yes; and that pigs ought to be dealt with in the same way as cattle; that is to say that tuberculosis should be treated as a localised disease.

2123. You are against the owners of foreign cattle being compensated, I gather?—I think it would be most unfair, and it would encourage the foreigners to send cattle into the country.

2124. You think that it would encourage

0.16.

Chairman—continued.

them to send diseased animals, if they were compensated?—Yes.

2125. And you do not think it would encourage British traders and feeders to send diseased meat to your market if the butcher was compensated?—My opinion is that if the butcher was compensated for the full value, it might. I should give him three-quarters of the value, letting him stand some risk, so as to make him careful in his transactions.

2126. Besides losing his one-fourth he would also lose his custom and his reputation?—Yes.

Sir Mark Stewart.

2127. Supposing you gave butchers compensation for foreign animals, do you think it could injure their home supply in any way?—I think it would encourage the foreign trade against the home produce.

2128. Have you heard many complaints among butchers on this question?—I have. I have heard repeated complaints about losing good carcasses.

2129. Do you think it is diverting the animals from the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—I know that we have lost several tenants who have gone into the foreign cattle at Deptford, and left home cattle altogether.

2130. Where does the home trade go?—It goes to other markets, where they get a more ready sale.

2131. And is it the same with pigs?—It is the same with pigs.

2132. If a pig is in any way affected it is wholly destroyed?—Yes.

2133. The affected part is not cut out?—Not in London.

2134. Do you see any remedy in this case towards stamping out tuberculosis if the trade were compensated?—I think it would encourage the farmer to test animals for tuberculosis.

2135. And it would induce the buyer to buy the home cattle?—Yes, he would have more confidence in purchasing the stock.

2136. Whereas now he neglects the home cattle and takes foreign?—Yes.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

2137. Outside the markets in which you are engaged there are in London several other places, are there not, where cattle are slaughtered?—I do not know the correct number, but I think I am right in saying that there are only six private slaughter-houses in the city.

2138. I wanted to know whether you had any knowledge of what prevails outside the city?—There are a number of slaughter-houses throughout the county of London.

2139. And every Metropolitan Borough Council is an authority charged with the duty of inspection?—That is so.

2140. And of condemnation?—That is so.

2141. Is there a uniform practice in this matter throughout London?—No.

N

2142. May

7 July 1904.]

Mr. KING.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

2142. May I take it that in some of the Metropolitan boroughs there is practically no inspection whatever?—That is my opinion.

2143. And that in other Metropolitan boroughs there is very rigid inspection?—That is so.

2144. Is it a fact that certain butchers have branch establishments within the boundaries of many of the London boroughs?—I believe so.

2145. Trading consequently in several different markets?—Yes.

2146. How would that affect any proposal that this loss should be covered by a system of trade insurance?—No matter where the slaughter-house is, there would always be an inspector.

2147. The risk on purchases in one slaughter-house, then, would be very different from the risk by purchase in another?—It would be, unless there was uniformity of inspection.

2148. Would you favour uniformity of inspection?—I would.

2149. You think it ought to be established by law?—I think so.

2150. Both in the interest of trade and in the interest of the consuming public?—That has been my opinion for some time.

2151. But that throughout London this uniformity is more notorious by its absence than by any attempt to establish it?—That is so.

2152. With regard to the cows and oxen sold in the London markets, may I take it that under ordinary conditions a well fattened cow being sold for human food should fetch per cwt. a price somewhat approximating the price which would be paid for bull beef?—Yes, but the carcass would be sold as cow-beef.

2153. Approximating to that price?—Yes.

2154. As a matter of fact owing to the fear that the butcher will sustain loss in the purchase, is there a very marked difference per cwt. in the selling price of these two?—A cow would fetch most money.

2155. Most money per cwt.?—Yes.

2156. Notwithstanding the risk?—I understood that you were talking to me about the meat—the carcass which would be passed and sold per cwt.

2157. No, I am taking the case of an animal brought up for sale. The butcher realises that if he purchases a cow there is a great risk, whereas if he purchases an ox the risk is slight. I want to find out, if I can, what influence this has upon the selling price per cwt. of these two animals?—Not much; because so many people have to make a living that there is rather a competition for that class of meat.

2158. The difference would not be as much as from 10s. to 14s. per cwt.?—Not so much as that.

2159. Not in your judgment?—No.

2160. You gave us some evidence with regard to calves; those were specially selected animals?—That is so, selected for a purpose other than for post-mortems for tuberculosis.

Chairman—continued.

2161. But there had been a prior selection; they were not an average sample?—Yes, they were an average sample, they were all Irish calves.

2162. The butchers purchasing these calves may be assumed to have purchased them in thorough good faith?—Yes, that is so.

2163. And the loss fell entirely upon them?—Yes, that is so.

Mr. Loyd.

2164. Have you had any experience of Deptford?—Yes.

2165. I suppose there is an enormous number of beasts slaughtered there every day?—Yes, every day.

2166. Does the great number of beasts slaughtered there make it impossible for the inspector there, as it does at Birkenhead, to examine the carcass with the offal?—All the offal is hung up for his inspection in every slaughter-house.

2167. But is it hung up in connection with the carcass from which it has come?—Not always.

2168. So that the inspector has not at Deptford, any more than at Birkenhead, an opportunity of seeing the carcass and at the same time the offal which has been removed from that carcass?—I do not think that is necessary.

2169. I did not ask you that. Does he do so; does he see the two together?—Yes, as nearly as possible in the same slaughter-house. It is impossible for him to distinguish between the lungs of one animal and another; but they must not be removed from the slaughter-house until after he has examined say 10 offals for 10 carcasses.

2170. But which belongs to which he has no means of telling?—No, not by looking at the organs only.

2171. Do you agree with the inspector from Birkenhead, that it is a great assistance to the inspector to see the offal in connection with the carcass?—I do not. I think if the inspector knows his work he can give an opinion by examining the carcass.

2172. You think that he does not require to see the offal?—He does not require to see all the offal; he can give his opinion by examining the carcass only.

2173. Do you say that he is not assisted in arriving at his opinion by having a clue to the likelihood of disease existing, by seeing whether it exists in the offal?—The disease may exist in the offal, and there may be no clue in the carcass.

2174. It might be so; but do you not agree with the Birkenhead inspector, that it is a great facility and guide to the inspector to see the offal as well as the carcass?—Certainly.

2175. With regard to home-produced meat is there not a greater facility for the inspector to see the offal at the same time as he sees the carcass?—No.

2176. Does the same rule prevail throughout London, that the offal is removed? He has to examine the offal to see if it is sound, but throughout London it is not examined with

7 July 1904.]

Mr. KING.

[Continued.]

Mr. Loyd—continued.

with the carcass?—It would be impossible to act up to that, because each chamber or slaughter-house may have killing going on at the same time, and you would require about 10 to 12 inspectors, an inspector for every animal.

2177. So that if you were examining 10 or a dozen carcasses, it would be an advantage to the inspector to see the offal at the same time, and yet you forego that advantage on account of the number slaughtered?—Yes.

2178. What examination takes place with regard to meat that comes into the country in the form of meat?—That is inspected for London at the Central Meat Market.

2179. Is it generally frozen meat?—Frozen and chilled, and you have fresh meat from Denmark.

2180. Do you find that those carcasses have been carefully trimmed before they come over here?—I cannot say for London, because I have not to do with carcasses outside the market; but I found it so in Manchester when I had to do with them there.

2181. The foreign producer knows perfectly well the advantage of removing certain parts from the carcass before he sends it over?—That is so.

2182. Has not that a tendency to make it more difficult for you to be sure as to the soundness of the carcass?—Not with regard to tuberculosis. I cannot see any difficulty in the inspector seeing whether a carcass is or is not tuberculous if he makes an examination of the lymphatic glands.

2183. Would it not be fairer to the inspector if he were allowed to see the whole of it dead?—Certainly.

2184. You think that there is undoubtedly a falling off in the market for home-grown meat as compared with foreign?—I do.

2185. Do you think that the impression amongst butchers, that it is easier to get foreign meat past the inspectors than home-produced meat, has got anything to do with that?—I think it is rather that there is less risk in purchasing foreign meat because they do not lose quite so many through tuberculosis.

Dr. Farquharson.

2186. I think as a matter of fact there is very little tuberculosis, is there, among foreign cattle?—Those figures show only a very small percentage in the number slaughtered at Deptford, if you refer to American cattle.

2187. Is that on account of the cattle leading a healthy open-air life?—No doubt that is so.

2188. But judging from your evidence, there is very little tuberculosis among the home cattle; you can only produce evidence of two out of over 10,000 animals destroyed?—I think I gave you more than that. I gave over 500 out of a total of 1,738—500 cows killed and 234 diseased animals out of the 500; which shows that tuberculosis is a very prevalent disease.

0.16.

Dr. Farquharson—continued.

2189. You say that there is a larger quantity of meat coming from abroad than used to come from abroad; that what we may call the finished article is much larger in quantity than it used to be?—Much larger.

2190. Is not that because this Government have shut out the Canadian stores; that since the Canadian stores, that is to say, the raw material, was shut out, the supply of the finished article has increased very much?—That is partly the reason, no doubt; but at the same time healthy foreign cattle can be purchased without the risk of losing them, and that is one of the principal causes.

2191. As a matter of fact the quality of meat sent from abroad, the finished article, has very much improved in the last few years?—Yes.

2192. Now that you have admitted that, do not you think it is rather the superior quality of the foreign meat, which is equal even to the excellent quality of our meat (excepting that of the very highest quality), which is the reason for the increase?—I daresay it is one reason.

2193. Rather than the fact that we have so much tuberculosis in our stock at home; in other words, do not you think that the growing demand for foreign meat is due to the fact that the quality of the foreign meat has so extremely improved in the last few years?—There is no doubt about it; because the cattle which come over here are simply English cattle sent over there and their progeny sent back.

2194. Do you not think that that does away with your contention, that the reason is, because tuberculosis exists among our animals at home?—I am afraid I do not quite understand the question.

2195. The point you want to make is that the increased demand for foreign meat is due to the fact that our British butchers are afraid to work with home-grown meat, in consequence of the danger of tuberculosis. My point is, that the growing demand for foreign meat is due to the fact that the quality of foreign meat has so much improved during the last few years?—That is so, yes.

Captain Ellice.

2196. I should like to ask you as to this contention that the supply of home-grown meat has decreased. Has the price of foreign meat increased or decreased?—It has decreased.

2197. Is home-grown fat stock at a lower price than it was before?—Home-grown stock are also decreasing.

2198. But not in price, surely?—Yes, in price.

2199. In the last three years as compared with the years 1895 to 1900?—Certainly, in the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

2200. But in country markets?—It must be so in country markets, because the dealers must purchase in country markets to sell again in London.

2201. I rather thought that in country markets the farmers were getting rather a better price

7 July 1904.]

MR. KING.

[Continued.]

Captain *Ellice*—continued.

price for their fat stock. The best fat stock bred in this country is being bought up in the country markets at the present time?—That is not the information that I receive from the salesmen in the Metropolitan Cattle Market. I can only give you the information that I get there.

2202. Do you think there is as big a supply at present as there was before the Canadian cattle came in, of home-grown fat stock and store cattle?—Not nearly so much.

2203. Have you any idea whether the price of stores in the country has gone up or down?—It has gone up; that is how the farmer is handicapped, the stores are so dear and finished meat so cheap.

2204. That has not raised the price of home-grown fat cattle?—No, on account of the foreign competition.

2205. Therefore do you think it would be better to allow these Canadian cattle to come in and allow the graziers to fatten stock as they used to do?—Yes, I am rather in favour of the Canadian stores.

Mr. *Field*.

2206. With regard to Danish carcasses, do you inspect the meat when it comes in?—Not in London; I used to do so in Manchester.

2207. You are aware that a great deal of frozen meat comes into the market?—Yes.

2208. With regard to pigs, have you had many complaints about the seizure of pigs lately in London?—Yes.

2209. From purchasers?—Yes, from purchasers and also from the consigners.

2210. Has the result been that less pigs are being consigned to you?—Not to me, but to those who are in the habit of receiving them.

2211. I mean to the market generally?—That is so; on account of that we are getting no pigs at all in the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

2212. You are getting no pigs at all?—No.

2213. So that the result of the confiscation has been, that the pig trade has been practically paralysed in London?—Yes, for the live trade in the market.

2214. And that is a very serious matter, of course?—Yes.

2215. And if it extended to all classes of stock you would be like Othello, your occupation would be gone?—They would not require me at all.

2216. You are aware that in different districts round you there are different systems of pig inspection; in some places it is not so severe as in others?—Yes, I know that is so.

2217. And the result is, of course, that there is uncertainty in the minds both of consigners and butchers?—That is so.

2218. Because there is not uniformity of inspection?—Yes.

2219. With regard to bulls, would you think

Mr. *Field*—continued.

that the tuberculosis test ought to be applied to all bulls in the country which are allowed to serve?—Yes.

2220. And with regard to the lymph of calves, is it the practice that calves are bought by the Local Government Board, or rather hired, I should say, for a certain time, and inoculated for vaccination purposes, and then brought in and sold again?—Yes.

2221. Are we to understand that the public authorities who exercise such discretion about compensation, sell these calves which have been inoculated for lymph purposes?—The whole of the calves have recovered from the inoculation. They are kept for a certain time until they have recovered entirely.

2222. Are they inspected?—Yes.

2223. Are they rigidly inspected?—Yes.

2224. And they are sold back to the butchers in the public market?—Yes.

2225. Dead?—Yes.

2226. Not alive?—No.

2227. You do not sell these calves alive?—We are not allowed to sell them alive, because a post-mortem must be made of every one.

2228. Are you aware that a calf which cost 6*l.* was sold to a man in the trade a few days ago, that he notified something which he thought was not all right, and it was confiscated in a private slaughter-house?—In the Metropolitan Cattle Market?

2229. Yes?—It is very probable. We get notice every day.

2230. That was in a private slaughter-house?—If it was in the Metropolitan Cattle Market I might get notice; if it was outside I would not.

2231. It would be within your area?—Yes, I have notices every day.

2232. Do you know how many private slaughter-houses there are in London?—I do not: I know there are 21 in the Metropolitan Cattle Market but the number outside I do not know.

2233. Would you be surprised to hear that there are something like 400?—No, I would not be surprised.

2234. You have to do entirely with Islington?—With Islington only.

2235. And the diminution in your numbers of cattle in Islington of late years has been very striking?—It has been.

2236. Say within the last 20 or 30 years?—Yes.

2237. The last time I was there there were hardly any cattle shown there. To what do you attribute that?—I believe the trade are afraid to purchase the cattle on account of the prevalence of tuberculosis; it is too great a risk.

2238. That is your solemn conviction as an official of London?—That is my conviction.

2239. Would the number of foreign cattle imported have been greater if the Argentine cattle were allowed in?—It might have been; but I think the numbers generally are up to the London supply.

2240. Is

7 July 1904.]

Mr. KING.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

2240. Is it your opinion then that there is less demand for home produce by reason of the fact of prosecution and persecution and annoyance about these tuberculosis confiscations?—No doubt that is one of the reasons.

2241. I do not think the Committee quite understand that at Deptford the foreign cattle are bought in the carcass, and therefore the man who buys a carcass of beef has no danger from this prosecution?—That is so.

2242. But what he buys in Islington is bought alive, and the danger faces him?—Yes.

2243. That is one of the reasons why you

Mr. Field—continued.

have less cattle at Islington?—There is no doubt about it.

2244. Are you aware that the Cheshire County Council have passed a resolution with regard to anthrax, recommending compensation?—I think I have seen it.

2245. And you would recommend a similar course with regard to tuberculosis?—Yes.

2246. In the interest of public health?—Yes.

2247. And of the cattle trade?—Yes.

2248. And you think that that compensation should come from Imperial funds?—Yes.

MR. GEORGE PATRICK TERRETT, called; and Examined.

Chairman.

2249. I believe you are Chief Inspector of Meat for the City of London?—I am.

2250. And you have charge of the meat markets at Smithfield, Leadenhall, and Aldgate?—Yes.

2251. You gave evidence, I think, on the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis?—I did.

2252. And you expressed an opinion in favour of compensation?—Yes.

2253. Which opinion you still hold?—Yes.

2254. You consider the English dealer is handicapped by the knowledge that his goods are liable to be seized?—Yes.

2255. And that he is liable to be prosecuted?—Yes, he is equally liable to have his goods seized with the foreigner, and he has the danger of prosecution in addition.

2256. If a man has foreign meat infected by tuberculosis on his premises, is not that an offence against the English law?—Certainly it is.

2257. Then a man who has foreign meat can be prosecuted just as much as a man who has English meat?—I am speaking of the man to whom the meat originally belonged, not the retailer in whose hands it may be found. I have chiefly to do with the wholesale trade.

2258. But the man who is prosecuted is the man who has it on his premises, whether it is foreign or home-fed meat?—Yes.

2259. And you think that is a particular grievance with regard to pigs?—Yes.

2260. You agree with the last witness as to the difficulty of discovering the disease in pigs?—I do.

2261. And is it also your opinion that Sir Herbert Maxwell's Commission was a little too stringent in its suggestion as to the condemnation of pigs?—I am hardly prepared to go as far as that. I think with respect to pigs they are things which you should be exceedingly careful about. A pig ought to be very good; it ought to be, like *Cæsar's wife*, above suspicion.

Chairman—continued.

2262. You enquired, I think, at the end of last year of a number of salesmen, into the question of the loss of pigs?—I did, from a great number of Smithfield salesmen.

2263. What was their estimate of the loss which they have sustained?—Their estimate of the loss varied from 10 to 60 per cent.

2264. Did you select certain typical cases to place before the Committee?—I took four cases which I considered to be typical, and if you please I will give you their opinions in detail. One man said that he is in a large way of business in English, Irish, and Dutch pork, and he estimates that he is receiving 25 to 30 per cent. less home-grown pork than he should, owing to the restrictions. He thinks that farmers must be producing less pork, as prices have been encouraging to send. He thinks that the recommendations of the Royal Commission cannot be so strictly enforced in some other places as they are in London, as parts of pigs have been sent to them some of which have been seized; and they have no information that the same thing has happened to the other parts. He does not believe in tuberculous pork being sold; but thinks that well-nourished pigs which show no sign until killed should be paid for.

2265. I think I must have misunderstood you. You said that these various estimates of loss were from 10 to 60 per cent. You mean the loss of trade in English pigs?—I mean the loss of the quantity of pork received by them for sale.

2266. You do not mean loss in money, but loss in trade?—I do not mean actual loss; I mean diminution of trade.

2267. I gather from your proof that your general opinion is that pigs are not now being sent into the London market?—I am sure of it.

2268. We have had the figures, I think, of foreign meat coming in; but you have some figures here which you may just give as regards the Central Meat Market. What was the percentage of British meat in 1896?—In 1896, 51 per

7 July 1904.]

Mr. TERRETT.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

per cent. of the meat sent into the Central Market was British grown.

2269. And in 1903 what was the state of things?—In 1903 it had fallen to 29 per cent.

2270. You have here specific instances of loss in the pig trade. For instance, a Buckinghamshire dealer sent up 33 pigs alive, of which four were seized?—Those I should tell you are only a few instances among very many, and these are taken because they all occurred during the current week.

2271. Four pigs out of 35 were seized from Buckinghamshire?—Yes.

2272. I think you may as well give the other cases?—A Middlesex dealer had 14 pigs, and had two seized; a Surrey butcher had seven pigs and two seized, and a Suffolk dealer had 45 pigs and had 15 seized.

2273. You consider that insurance against that loss is impossible, do you?—Under the general system of English trading I think it is. I think it is very difficult to trace the identity of the animal.

Sir Mark Stewart.

2274. What pork supplies the London market if the home-grown pork cannot get in?—We get Dutch pork in very large quantities.

2275. Where does it come from chiefly?—From various places in Holland; from the Hook of Holland, from The Hague, from Rotterdam, from Essen, and other places in Holland.

2276. Is it good pork?—Some of it is good.

2277. You cannot tell, of course, whether it is diseased in any way?—Only by cutting it, and by examination. I should tell you that the Dutch Government have recently introduced a system of examination, which is having a very serious effect upon the home-grown pork trade. There are a great number of people in London who know but little of the article that they are buying, and they prefer to spend their money for an article which is certified by a veterinary inspector at the place of slaughter, in preference to taking the risk of that which may come from a country dealer who himself is almost ignorant of the appearance of the disease.

Chairman.

2278. Then what condemnation there is of those pigs is done abroad before they come here?—They are examined abroad; but I am sorry to say that they do not at present keep back the unsound ones.

2279. But the examination abroad is, I suppose, for the purpose of checking the sending of unsound meat out of their country?—Yes; and then they send the sound ones labelled and the unsound ones unlabelled.

Chairman—continued.

2280. Then the moment you see an unlabelled one you have reason to suspect that it is unsound?—Yes.

2281. And your inspectors examine it?—They make a critical examination.

Sir Mark Stewart.

2282. Do they condemn the foreign pork in anything like the same proportion as English pork?—Yes, in some cases quite as great a proportion.

2283. Do you think it is necessary to make such a wholesale condemnation?—I should rather hesitate to say that it is not necessary. It is at present at any rate in strict accordance with the instructions of the Local Government Board.

2284. But you do not think it is necessary?—There are some cases in which it might not be necessary perhaps to go quite so far.

2285. If you cut out the infected parts would not that answer the purpose?—In some instances, yes.

2286. Of course you would leave it to the discretion of the inspector?—It must of necessity be left to the discretion of the inspector.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

2287. A word with regard to this Dutch practice. These animals carry a label?—They do.

2288. And if any of these animals carrying a label is found to be affected with tuberculosis on the return of the label compensation is paid by the Dutch Government?—Yes. We have an arrangement by which they take the label and return it through the Dutch Consul, and then the value of the pig is paid to the owner by the Dutch Government.

2289. And the fact that this compensation exists in connection with these Dutch pigs is in your judgment rapidly driving the English trade out of the market?—The competition with Dutch pork generally is rapidly driving the English trade out of the market.

2290. And this is one feature of it?—That is one factor in it.

2291. And an important factor?—By no means an unimportant one.

2292. I believe that our English buyers go round the markets seeking out pigs bearing these labels?—There is certainly a preference growing up for pigs bearing these labels.

2293. You have given us a number of cases which have occurred this week; could you trace these back to the district where the dealers gathered them?—Yes.

2294. I do not want you to mention the name of the town, but can you say from your experience gathered during the last three weeks, that there is a particular town the whole country around which is infected with tuberculosis at the present moment?—Yes, I can.

2295. If your local authority here in London had the power to notify back to the County Council of the infected districts, much might be done

7 July 1904.]

Mr. TERRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

done in your judgment to purify those districts?—I think very much. I take it that the mere compensation is only a very small part of the case.

2296. That is the next step I was leading to; that if the City Corporation or the various borough councils in London were penalised by having to pay compensation, they would take active steps to purify the sources from which the meat came?—Naturally, they would require that something should be done in the locality from which it originated.

2297. And your experience shows you that you can spot the localities where it is occurring?—We are constantly doing that with regard to prosecutions of persons for sending diseased meat up to London. We can trace the thing out with the greatest certainty.

2298. And this is so well known in the market that certain of those districts at the present moment are boycotted?—Yes, that is so.

2299. Under your advice?—Yes.

2300. So that with this wide experience that you have, you inform the Committee that there is no difficulty whatever in the majority of cases in tracing the animal back to the district from which it came?—I think there is no difficulty whatever.

2301. Now, you have given this question of insurance against loss considerable attention for some years I understand?—Yes, I have thought it over very seriously for a long time.

2302. And that has led you to form the conclusion that there should be some compensation paid to the man who loses an animal which is seized?—I have been confronted with such a great number of them bought in the full belief that they were sound, honest, and perfectly fit for human food, and subsequently, on slaughtering and inspection, have proved to be otherwise, that I really see no other course except to ask that the butchers should be compensated out of the public funds.

2303. When a butcher purchases a foreign bred animal at Deptford, does he purchase it as a live animal or as a dead carcass?—Nearly all the meat that is slaughtered at Deptford comes through the Central Market, and there it is bought as carcass meat; it is transferred from the slaughter-houses at Deptford to the dead meat market at Smithfield.

2304. Where does the inspection take place?—In both places: both at the place of slaughter and again at Smithfield.

2305. When does the butcher buy it—before or after it is slaughtered?—He buys it after, he buys it as dead meat. That meat is then in the hands of the carcass butcher.

2306. That is a very important fact. We have had witnesses who have given us testimony to the effect that the loss to the butcher owing to the foreign trade is very small, because the butcher is able to buy it, knowing exactly the condition of the carcass when he purchases it, is that so?—That is so. I have no doubt that the prevalence of tuberculosis among our

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

own cattle has caused a great many buyers to go to Deptford and buy their meat dead instead of buying it alive.

Chairman.

2307. Somebody else takes the risk?—Yes.

2308. And that goes on to the value of the animal. The intermediate man does not take the risk for nothing?—But the intermediate man is the carcass butcher.

2309. Does he mind the loss?—The carcass butcher deals in foreign animals, so that the trade is driven away from the English trade, in which a butcher goes and buys one bullock and kills it, to the foreign trade, which is part of the business of a man who goes and buys them in hundreds.

Mr. Ernest Gray

2310. Is the price of a foreign carcass in the market the same as the price of an English carcass in the market?—It may be slightly less, but very slightly, not enough to account for any change in the channel of trade.

2311. It may be slightly less?—It may be slightly less.

2312. Therefore if the carcass butcher is carrying the risk, he does not seem to have increased the price. You say the price of the carcass is actually less?—Yes, but as between foreign and English.

2313. Who does bear the loss of the seizure and condemnation for tuberculosis in the case of the foreign animal?—The butcher purchases the carcass after inspection. That animal comes in alive.

2314. Who has borne the loss?—Probably the importer of the animal.

2315. Have you given your attention at all to the comparisons which are inevitable between the seizure of meat affected with tuberculosis and the seizure of other food, such as oysters, tinned food, fruit, and so forth?—Yes. I do not think the two things are on the same lines at all.

2316. Where is the difference?—Probably in the case of tinned fruits and all those things, they are given up by the person who deals with them as trade refuse pure and simple. Further, they are known to be an article involving extraordinary risk. The original value of those things is a mere nothing. The freight is the principal part of it. The first cost being so small there is ample margin for profit to take all the very great risks which attend the business.

2317. Take the case of fresh fruit; is it within your knowledge that at the present moment there is a block in the trade in imported fruit?—Yes, there is. There is a hitch between the importers of fruit and those on the other side who send it over.

2318. Why?—It appears that up to last year it had been the practice of dealers here to take the fruit on board, but so much was lost last year

7 July 1904.]

Mr. TERRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ernest Gray—continued.

year that this year they have refused to take it except on delivery here.

2319. So that this question of the loss through contamination of fresh fruit is being avoided now?—It is being avoided simply because it is blocking the trade. There is a hitch in which neither party will give way.

Chairman.

2320. They require a warranty, in other words?—Yes, they require it delivered here.

Mr. Ernest Gray.

2321. Or, in other words, they will not accept it, except on full disclosure; they will not purchase until they know it is sound?—Yes.

2322. And a butcher has no chance of doing that?—A butcher has no chance of doing it, because he does not discover that his tuberculous beast is tuberculous until he has paid for it and taken it home and slaughtered it.

2323. Just dealing for a moment with the analogy which has been brought up here several times, when fruit is brought over in packages it is possible for the purchaser to have half a dozen packages broken open and all tested?—Yes.

2324. And knowing that they have all come from one district, under the same climatic conditions, if he finds the six are sound the probabilities are that the remainder are sound?—Taking them on delivery here would entitle him to make any amount of examination.

2325. But if a man purchases 100 head of cattle, if he has six killed, and they are found to be sound, that is no guarantee that the other 94 are sound?—None whatever.

2326. Does that constitute a very considerable difference between the purchase of animals alive and the purchase of fruit and other commodities?—It seems to me that this trade in cattle, being liable to seizure for tuberculosis is on the same lines as nothing else. I know of an instance of a little man just recently who bought a bullock in the market for 24*l.* and hung it up in his slaughter-house, where it was found to be very badly tuberculous. He showed it to the man from whom he had bought it, the original seller, who said, "I can only advise you to take it out into the backyard and throw some chloride of lime over it"; but the purchaser said, "Half my trading capital is locked up in that bullock."

Chairman.

2327. Did the man from whom he bought it offer to help him?—Yes, he told him that he had some more of the bullocks at home, and if he liked to get into his trap and go to his home

Chairman—continued.

he might have anyone that he liked for half the money.

Captain Ellice.

2328. Would you destroy milk if you found it tuberculous?—That I have nothing to do with.

2329. Do you think that it would be advisable?—I do not think that milk from cow with tuberculosis ought to be allowed to be used. But that is really a matter of inspection of the live animal, which is for the veterinary inspector rather than within my scope.

2330. Supposing that in one milk shop in London you found tuberculous milk, would you think it desirable that it should be destroyed?—Certainly.

2331. Are you in favour of compensation for tuberculous milk?—No, I do not think so. I think that is due to the neglect of the man who owned the cow from which the milk was drawn.

2332. But it is rather hard upon the milkman who buys it, is it not?—The milkman ought to be able to trace the milk back to its original owner.

2333. You think that milkmen should only buy from dairies which are not tuberculous?—I think that milk is a thing that too much trouble cannot be taken about.

2334. In the case of pigs, are many pigs fatted on milk from butter factories?—I could not say, but no doubt a great many pigs become tuberculous from taking milk from tuberculous cows.

2335. There seems to be no doubt during this enquiry that most tuberculosis exists in milking cows and old cows?—I think that is so.

2336. You have no statistics to prove whether those pigs which are tuberculous are principally fatted on milk from butter factories?—I have no means of knowing, although I have but little doubt that it is so.

Dr. Farquharson.

2337. You think it is a grievance that the home buyer is liable to prosecution for selling a diseased carcass, whereas the foreigner who sends those animals over gets off scot free?—I say that chiefly in regard to the person who sends the meat here to be sold. We prosecute people who send diseased meat from the country into the London market to be sold, and the foreigner who sends diseased meat into the London market also to be sold we cannot prosecute.

Chairman.

2338. Are you sure that you prosecute the man who sends the meat to be sold? You prosecute the man who exposes it for sale?—No, we prosecute the man who sends the meat to be sold.

2339. For what offence?—For depositing meat unfit for food for sale in the London market. I have prosecuted some hundreds.

2340. You

7 July 1904.]

Mr. TERRETT.

[Continued.]

Chairman—continued.

2340. You prosecute the man who exposes it for sale?—No, not the man who exposes it for sale. The man who receives it here and would expose it for sale is merely a commission agent. His practice is to call the attention of the inspector to the unsound article which is deposited with him for sale, and then the sender of that article is prosecuted for sending it. That is not putting it exactly in legal terms.

Mr. Field.

2341. Does not that only apply to the wholesale market and not to the butcher's shop?—It is the wholesale market that I am speaking of.

Dr. Farquharson.

2342. Then the point of your grievance is this, that the home buyer is liable to prosecution, and perhaps the ruin of his trade, for selling a tuberculous bit of meat, but the foreigner who does the same thing gets off scot free; is not that so?—Yes, I think that is so.

2343. And you think that that difficulty would be removed if guilty knowledge was made part of the offence?—I have not meant to suggest that.

2344. In the third section of your proof you state that the English dealer is seriously handicapped by the fact that while his goods are equally liable to be seized with those of the foreigner, he is in addition liable to prosecution under a statute in which guilty knowledge is no part of the offence. So that if guilty knowledge was made part of the offence, that is to say, if he was obliged to prove that he sold it without guilty knowledge, he would get off?—Guilty knowledge in the case of diseased meat would in the majority of instances be almost impossible to prove. I have not meant to suggest in those words there that guilty knowledge should necessarily be part of the offence; but I merely desired to state as a simple record of the fact that by the statute under which the Englishman would be prosecuted guilty knowledge is not of necessity part of the offence.

2345. Is there any reason why pigs should be much more subject to tuberculosis than other animals?—There is a great deal in the question which the honourable member asked me about pigs taking milk from a tuberculous cow. I have no doubt that in that way they become tuberculous, because there are certain other facts that I know, but it is a long story. Pigs very generally become tuberculous by ingestion, whereas cattle more frequently become tuberculous by inhalation.

2346. I think I followed from your evidence that in the case of pigs which are affected only in some degree in their glands, the whole carcass is destroyed?—Yes.

2347. Is that in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission?—The words of the Royal Commission are, that where pigs show evidence of tuberculosis in any degree the carcass and organs are to be destroyed.

2348. In the case of pigs coming from abroad, the glands are removed and all traces of

Chairman—continued.

tuberculosis therefore vanish?—If pigs come from abroad with the glands removed, we make a pretty good search for anything that remains—sometimes successfully and sometimes not.

Mr. Field.

2349. I think you said that your trade in pigs is 60 per cent. less now?—Some of the salesmen estimated their receipt of English pigs at 60 per cent. less than it was before the examination was so strict as it is now in consequence of the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

2350. What has filled up that deficit; because the supply, of course, generally comes, no matter where from?—I take it that it is largely made up by Dutch pork.

2351. And where you confiscate these pigs what do you do with them?—Destroy them—boil them down.

2352. And the same with the Dutch pigs?—Yes.

2353. Have you had many cases with Dutch pigs?—I have a very great many still, but not many as we had some time ago.

2354. But you are not able to prosecute the Dutchman?—No.

2355. And you can prosecute the Englishman?—Yes.

2356. You are able to find him and bring him into court?—Yes.

2357. That is a privilege retained by the Englishman. The foreigner can do it for nothing?—Yes.

2358. That is one of the peculiarities of English law?—Yes.

2359. Do you think that your own system of inspection is too severe?—I think it is excessive. I think that we should be very particular in the matter of the pig, but I hardly believe in going so far as we do.

2360. Are you aware that in other cases they only take the head off and cut the neck glands and use the carcass?—I know that it is done in some parts of England.

2361. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that the Dutch Government give compensation to their men whose pigs are confiscated here—at any rate partial compensation?—They give compensation to those whose pigs bear the label of the Government examiner.

2362. Only those?—Only those which bear the label.

2363. The English Government have not got that far yet?—No.

2364. Would you recommend a similar course in regard to every species of animal here as that which is adopted by the Dutch and other Governments—that is, compensation?—With regard to well nourished tuberculous animals, I would.

2365. I want to know, do you inspect these Danish carcasses of frozen, chilled, and refrigerated beef that come into the Central Meat Market?—They all come under me.

2366. You know what the clods of beef are?—Yes.

2367. Do you take the clods off them?—Wherever it is necessary.

O

2368. Then

7 July 1904.]

Mr. TERRETT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Field—continued.

2368. Then a great many are not taken off?
 --The majority are not taken off.

2369. Have you to take the word of the man on the other side with regard to this very low class of meat called clod meat; have you to take the American invoice?—Yes.

2370. Is it your opinion that a good deal of this clod meat if it were killed in this country under similar conditions, would be confiscated? --I have examined it very carefully, and I have never found anything to justify such a conclusion.

2371. You have never found any sign of localised tuberculosis?—Never from first to last I have seen a great deal of it and I have made a critical examination of it and have taken a great deal of trouble over that matter because it is one that troubled me.

2372. Your experience and examination into this matter have led you to believe that the system of insurance is not practicable in connection with this compensation question?—I do not know how it could be.

2373. I think you told us, and I think it is very important, that 71 per cent. of the meat sold now in the Central Meat Market is foreign?—Yes.

2374. That is to say, in the capital of England there is only 29 per cent. of native produced meat?—I do not think that quite represents the figures in regard to the metropolis generally.

Mr. Field—continued.

2375. I am only dealing with what is exposed in the Central Meat Market?—That is the case in regard to the Central Meat Market.

2376. Do you think that that 71 per cent. of foreign meat is always sold as foreign meat?—I have no reason to suppose that it is not.

2377. You do not know one way or the other?—No.

2378. That is not quite in your line?—It has been.

2379. One question with regard to seizures of tuberculous meat. You say that that is not at all analogous to the case of fruit and fish and other things?—It stands on a different footing altogether; there is no sort of comparison; it is not in the same street with it.

2380. Because the buyer buys the beast or pig, or whatever it may be, as a healthy animal at the fair market price?—There is a presumption that it is so.

2381. And then he has in addition, particularly in this hot weather, and in what we call damp, muggy weather, to face the chance of his meat getting bad; so that he has as great a risk as the fruit merchant or any other?—He has the same risk from the climatic conditions as the fruit merchant or any other, and he certainly does not want this risk about tuberculosis into the bargain.

2382. You are in favour of compensation from Imperial funds?—I am.

A P P E N D I X .

LIST OF APPENDICES.

APPENDIX No. 1.	
Paper handed in by Bailie Anderson, J.P. -	PAGE 109
APPENDIX No. 2.	
Paper handed in by Bailie Anderson, J.P. -	112
APPENDIX No. 3.	
Paper handed in by Mr. Andrew Beveridge -	116
APPENDIX No. 4.	
Paper handed in by the Chairman -	125
APPENDIX No. 5.	
Paper handed in by Mr James King -	126

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX No. 1.

PAPER handed in by Bailie *Anderson, J.P.*

During the year 1903, 53,483 swine were slaughtered in Glasgow. Of these, 2,132, or 3·99 per cent., were found to be affected with tuberculosis. Of the 2,132 swine affected, 75 were totally destroyed, 1,905 were partially destroyed (heads only), whilst 152 were passed (some of the internal organs only being affected).

The majority of swine slaughtered in Glasgow are from 1½ cwt. to 2 cwt. in weight.

Taking the average price of pork as sold in the wholesale market in Glasgow during the year 1903 as 50s. 9d. per cwt., and the average weight as 2 cwt., the seizure of the

	£.	s.	d.
75 swine means a financial loss to the traders of	-	-	-
1,905 heads (16 lbs. at 3d. per lb.) at 4s.	-	-	-
	380	12	6
	381	-	-
Total loss to the trade,	£.	761	12 6

CAPITAL INVESTED IN THE SWINE SLAUGHTERED.

	£.	s.	d.
53,483 swine, at 1½ cwt., at 50s. 9d. per cwt.	169,641	7	9½
53,483 swine, at 2 cwt., at 50s. 9d. per cwt.	271,426	4	6
Loss incurred through seizure on account of tuberculosis	-	-	-
	£.	761	12 6

PROFIT AND LOSS.

Profit or Commission on 53,483 swine at, say, 1s. per head	-	-	-	2,674	3	-
Loss incurred through seizure on account of tuberculosis	-	-	-	761	12	6
Net profit	-	-	-	£.	1,912	10 6

The loss to the trade on account of tuberculosis during the year 1903 was equivalent to 3·41d. per pig slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

	£.	s.	d.
53,483 swine at 4d. per head	-	-	-
Total loss on account of tuberculosis	-	-	-
	891	7	8
	761	12	6
Surplus	£.	129	15 2

The whole loss incurred by the pig dealers in Glasgow could be covered by an outlay of 2d. paid by the seller and 2d. paid by the buyer, and which, after covering the whole loss to the trade, would leave a surplus of 129l. 15s. 2d. during the year 1903.

Owing to the thorough inspection of all swine slaughtered in Glasgow, pigs from known infected areas are seldom now sent to the City for slaughter, but were compensation to be paid, the traders, being relieved of all financial responsibilities as regards loss by seizure on account of tuberculosis, would in all probability reintroduce pigs from these infected places, and consequently a higher compensation would need to be paid by the ratepayers of Glasgow.

During the year 1903, of 7,658 cattle slaughtered in the Milton and Victoria Street Abattoirs, 6,744 were oxen 395 were bulls, 199 were cows, and 320 were heifers.

Suppose that each of the 6,744 home oxen to be of average value of 20l., the whole would represent the sum of 134,880l. of invested capital.

Of the 6,744 oxen slaughtered—

	£.	s.	d.
7 were totally destroyed on account of tuberculosis, at 20l.	-	-	-
22 were partially " " " say at 5l.	-	-	-
	140	-	-
	110	-	-
	£.	250	-

The loss to the trade on the 6,744 oxen slaughtered during the year 1903 in the Milton and Victoria Street Abattoirs was equivalent to 8·89 pence per ox slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

	£.	s.	d.
6,744 oxen at 1s.	-	-	-
Loss thorough seizure on account of tuberculosis	-	-	-
	337	4	-
	250	-	-
Surplus	£.	87	4 -

If the buyer and seller had each given 6d. per ox, it would have covered all loss and left a balance of 87l. 4s.

HOME BULLS.

Suppose that each of the 395 bulls be of the average value of 20*l.*, the whole would have represented the sum of 7,900*l.* of invested capital.

Of the 395 bulls slaughtered—

	£.	s.	d.
1 was totally destroyed on account of tuberculosis, at 20 <i>l.</i>	20	—	—
1 was partially " " " at 5 <i>l.</i>	5	—	—
	£. 25	—	—

The loss to the trade on the 395 bulls slaughtered during the year 1903 in the Milton and Victoria [Street] Abattoirs was equivalent to 15*l.* 19*d.* per bull slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

	£.	s.	d.
395 bulls at 1 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	29	12	6
Loss through seizure on account of tuberculosis	25	—	—
Surplus	£. 4	12	6

If the buyer and seller had each given 9*d.* per bull, it would have covered all loss and have left a balance of 4*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

HOME COWS.

No estimate can be given in the case of cows, as many of the animals returned here as tubercular were consigned to either of these abattoirs by stock owners on account of their unthrifty condition. To estimate, therefore, on the numbers totally or partially destroyed would be misleading, in so far as it would give a grossly exaggerated idea of the pecuniary loss to the trade.

HOME HEIFERS.

Suppose that each of the 320 heifers be of the average value of 15*l.* the whole would represent a sum of 4,800*l.* of invested capital.

Of the 320 heifers slaughtered—

	£.	s.	d.
2 were totally destroyed on account of tuberculosis, at 15 <i>l.</i>	30	—	—
5 were partially " " " at 5 <i>l.</i>	25	—	—
	£. 55	—	—

The loss to the trade on the 320 home heifers slaughtered during the year 1903 in the Milton and Victoria Street Abattoirs was equivalent to 41*l.* 25*d.* per heifer slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

	£.	s.	d.
320 heifers at 3 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	56	—	—
Loss through seizure on account of tuberculosis	55	—	—
Surplus	£. 1	—	—

If the buyer and seller had each given 1*s.* 9*d.* per heifer, it would have covered all loss and have left a balance of £1.

Take for the same period the animals slaughtered at Yorkhill Foreign Animals Wharf.

Of the 39,638 cattle slaughtered, 35,854 were oxen, 2,826 were bulls, 540 were cows, and 418 were heifers.

Suppose that each of the 35,854 foreign oxen be of the average value of 20*l.*, the whole would represent the sum of 717,080*l.* of invested capital.

Of the 35,854 oxen slaughtered—

	£.	s.	d.
1 was totally destroyed on account of tuberculosis, at 20 <i>l.</i>	20	—	—
5 were partially " " " at 5 <i>l.</i>	25	—	—
	£. 45	—	—

The loss to the trade on 35,854 foreign oxen slaughtered during the year 1903 in Yorkhill Foreign Animals Wharf was equivalent to 0*l.* 30 of a penny per ox slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

35,854 oxen at 1 <i>s.</i>	£1,792	14	0
35,854 oxen at 1 <i>d.</i>	149	7	10
Loss through seizure on account of tuberculosis	45	—	—
Surplus	£. 104	7	10

If the buyer and seller had each given one halfpenny per ox it would have covered all loss and left a balance of 104*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*

FOREIGN BULLS.

Suppose that each of the 2,826 bulls be of the average value of 20*l.*, the whole would represent a sum of 56,520*l.*

Of the 2,826 bulls slaughtered—

2 were totally destroyed on account of tuberculosis, at 20 <i>l.</i>	-	-	-	-	40	-	-
6 were partially	"	"	"	at 5 <i>l.</i>	-	-	-
					30	-	-
					<hr/>		
					70	-	-
					<hr/>		

The loss to the trade on the 2,826 foreign bulls slaughtered during the year 1903 at Yorkhill Foreign Animals Landing Wharf was equivalent to 5·94 pence per bull slaughtered.

MUTUAL INSURANCE.

2,826 bulls at 6 <i>d.</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	13	-
Loss through seizure on account of tuberculosis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	-	-
										<hr/>		
Surplus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-
										<hr/>		

If the buyer and seller had each given 3*d.* per bull, it would have covered all loss, and have left a balance of 13*s.*

FOREIGN COWS AND HEIFERS.

None of the carcasses of the 540 cows and 418 heifers were, on *post-mortem* examination, found to be so extensively affected with tuberculosis as to warrant total or partial seizure.



APPENDIX No. 2.

PAPER handed in by *Bailie Anderson, J.P.*

STATISTICAL TABLES prepared by the Veterinary Surgeon to the Corporation of the City of Glasgow (Police Department) in connection with Meat Inspection, and handed in by Councillor W. F. Anderson to the Members of the Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill, 1904.

The following Table shows the Number of Home and Foreign Animals slaughtered during the Years 1901, 1902, and 1903.

HOME.

	Cattle.	Calves.	Sheep.	Swine.	Goats.	Total.
1901 - - - - -	46,784	1,902	261,873	41,746	16	352,321
1902 - - - - -	70,239	2,433	285,401	47,967	15	406,055
1903 - - - - -	47,362	2,325	271,385	53,483	24	374,579
	164,385	6,660	818,659	143,196	55	1,132,955

FOREIGN.

	Cattle.	Calves.	Sheep.	Swine.	Goats.	Total.
1901 - - - - -	49,881	—	37,424	—	—	87,305
1902 - - - - -	28,439	2	12,799	—	—	41,240
1903 - - - - -	39,638	2	11,938	—	—	51,578
	117,958	4	62,161	—	—	180,123

The following Tables show the Number of Home and Foreign Animals slaughtered during the Year 1903, the prevalence of Tuberculosis, and the measures taken with those carcasses found affected.

HOME ANIMALS.

Species.	Slaughtered.	TUBERCULAR.							
		Affected.		Measures Adopted.					
				Carcases Partially Destroyed.		Carcases Totally Destroyed.		Carcases Passed.	
	No.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.
Cattle - - - - -	47,362	7,484	15·80	771	10·30	1,096	14·64	5,617	75·06
Calves - - - - -	2,325	7	·30	—	—	4	57·14	3	42·86
Sheep - - - - -	271,385	1	·0003	—	—	1	100·00	—	—
Swine - - - - -	53,483	2,132	3·99	—	—	75	3·52	2,057	96·48

FOREIGN ANIMALS.

Species.	Slaughtered.	TUBERCULAR.							
		Affected.		Measures Adopted.					
				Carcases Partially Destroyed.		Carcases Totally Destroyed.		Carcases Passed.	
	No.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.
Cattle - - -	39,638	442	1.11	11	2.49	3	.68	428	96.83
Calves - - -	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheep - - -	11,938	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table showing the Number of Carcases of Home and Foreign Animals totally and partially destroyed on account of Tuberculosis during the years 1901, 1902 and 1903 :—

		Cattle.						Swine.	Sheep.	TOTAL.
		Oxen.	Bulls.	Cows.	Heifers.	Calves.	TOTAL.			
HOME :										
1901 - - -	{ Totals -	15	23	918	11	3	970	73	-	1,043
	{ Partial -	35	26	597	6	-	664	1,156	-	1,820
1902 - - -	{ Totals -	33	27	1,128	13	1	1,202	61	-	1,263
	{ Partial -	60	38	749	17	-	864	1,305	-	2,169
1903 - - -	{ Totals -	33	23	1,012	28	4	1,100	75	1	1,176
	{ Partial -	73	38	638	22	-	771	1,905	-	2,676
1901-3 - -	{ Totals -	81	73	3,058	52	8	3,272	209	1	3,482
	{ Partial -	168	102	1,984	45	-	2,299	4,366	-	6,665
FOREIGN :										
1901 - - -	{ Totals -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	{ Partial -	2	7	-	-	-	9	-	-	9
1902 - - -	{ Totals -	2	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	3
	{ Partial -	3	4	2	-	-	9	-	-	9
1903 - - -	{ Totals -	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
	{ Partial -	5	6	-	-	-	11	-	-	11
1901-3 - -	{ Totals -	3	2	1	-	-	6	-	-	6
	{ Partial -	10	17	2	-	-	29	-	-	29

This Table may appear to show a great pecuniary loss to the trade through the total or partial seizure of so many carcases on account of tuberculosis. These figures are misleading in that they give an exaggerated idea of the severity of the standard by which tubercular carcases are adjudicated, for these tables were compiled simply to show the prevalence of tuberculosis affecting the lower animals. Many of these animals were consigned to the different abattoirs by farmers on account of their unthrifty condition, and might, with equal accuracy, be returned as having been affected with some other morbid condition. To show that many of these animals were in a very

poor condition, all carcasses during the seven consecutive weeks ending 18th June, 1904, which were totally destroyed in Moore-street Abattoir on account of tuberculosis, were weighed and tabulated as follows :—

From 2nd May to 18th June, 1904, there were destroyed, on account of tuberculosis, 150 carcasses weighing a total of 464 cwts. 3 qrs. 22 lbs., or an average of 3 cwts. 0 qrs. 11 lbs. per carcass.

5 carcasses weighed from 1 to 2 cwts.			
83	"	"	2 to 3 "
*41	"	"	3 to 4 "
11	"	"	4 to 5 "
8	"	"	5 to 6 "
2	"	"	6 to 7 "
<hr/>			
150			

* Made up as follows :—

29 carcasses weighing from 3 to 3½ cwts.			
12	"	"	3½ to 4 "

Of the 21 carcasses weighing 4 cwts. and over—

20 were those of cows, and
1 was that of a bull.

21

During the same period the number of cattle slaughtered was 3,966.

It is impossible to state the number of carcasses, the owners of which would have received compensation if this Bill had been made law, but assuming, for the sake of argument, that the owners of all carcasses weighing 4 cwts. and over would have received compensation, then it follows that of the 150 carcasses totally destroyed only 21 would have so qualified for compensation. Of the 21 carcasses weighing 4 cwts. and over, 20 were those of cows and one was that of a bull.

Tuberculosis is a preventible disease, and as such no compensation ought to be paid for the seizure of a tubercular carcass.

To do so removes the stimulus on the part of the stockowner to eradicate the disease out of his herd.

The following Tables have been compiled to show the prevalence of tuberculosis among the different sexes of home cattle for the years 1902 and 1903 :—

The home cattle returned in this Table are those slaughtered in the Milton and Victoria Abattoirs only, as it is impossible to classify the cattle slaughtered in Moore Street Abattoir into oxen, bulls, cows, and heifers.

HOME CATTLE—1902.

	Slaughtered.	Tubercular.	Percentage.
Oxen - - - - -	7,902	273	3·45
Bulls - - - - -	433	50	11·54
Cows - - - - -	318	155	48·74
Heifers - - - - -	319	21	6·58
Calves - - - - -	765	3	·39

HOME CATTLE—1903.

	Slaughtered.	Tubercular.	Percentage.
Oxen - - - - -	6,744	267	3·95
Bulls - - - - -	395	60	15·18
Cows - - - - -	199	98	49·24
Heifers - - - - -	320	27	8·43
Calves - - - - -	776	1	·12

It will be seen that cows are affected to a much greater degree than are oxen, bulls, or heifers. The greater prevalence of tuberculosis among cows is well recognised by butchers, and consequently as the risk of seizure is greater a price commensurate with the risk is paid.

(Excerpt from the "Meat Trades' Journal and Cattle Salesman's Gazette," page 507, 5th May 1904.)

"Take the trade in cows for instance, which in Glasgow is very considerable. The stringency of the inspection during the past year or two, and the heavy losses incurred, has had the effect of driving a great many dealers out of this trade, so that now, being in few hands, it is the most profitable branch of the trade here. Competition being less keen, punters are able to make such allowance for a percentage of loss as was impossible a few years ago; and in consequence, they have for a considerable time been doing a much more profitable business than the men who are handling a better class of cattle. It is contended that with compensation from the rates there would be a boom in the cow trade, with increased competition and a consequent cutting down of profits. Another objection advanced by one or two wholesale men is that were compensation to become general many butchers who now buy in the meat market would be encouraged to buy alive, and thus the wholesale section of the trade would suffer."

APPENDIX No. 3.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Andrew Beveridge*.

EXCERPT from Annual Report of *A. Maxwell Williamson*, M.D., B.Sc., Chief Sanitary Inspector of the City of Edinburgh, for the Year 1903.

MEAT INSPECTION.

THE operations at the City Slaughter-houses have been daily conducted under the supervision of one of the Veterinary Inspectors, and the results of the inspection exercised are duly set forth as in former Reports, in the appended Table No. 1. On reference to this, it will be observed that 312 carcasses have been condemned as unfit for food, and subsequently destroyed. The description of these carcasses is detailed in the Table referred to, and in the following Table a description of the disease with which each was affected is given. For some years past, it has been customary to detail, in connection with tuberculous carcasses, the extent to which this disease infiltrated each, and in Table No. III. such information is again given.

The condition of Tuberculosis is probably of greatest interest, chiefly on account of the larger number of carcasses found affected with it. This condition, as is well known, is most commonly found in connection with cows. The proportion of cow carcasses condemned, to those slaughtered during the past year is, however, apt to be misleading without some explanation being offered.

During that period, 231 cows were slaughtered, and no fewer than 62, or 26·84 per cent. were condemned for Tuberculosis. This of course, is an unduly large proportion, but it must be remembered that the animals involved, represent in the majority of cases, weak and ailing cows sent to the Slaughter-houses by dairymen and others in the surrounding districts, on account of their unhealthy condition.

In former years, it was customary to send for slaughter to the City Abattoir a considerable number of **fat** cows, purchased at the Weekly Fat Stock Sales. This custom is now completely in abeyance, as in all cases, these animals are immediately despatched to places outside the City, the majority of them going to England immediately after the Sales are completed.

In addition to the inspection referred to as being exercised within the precincts of the Slaughter-houses, similar work has been carried out at the Railway Stations, in the various Markets, and throughout all the shops situated within the City. A large number of seizures of diseased and unsound food of a miscellaneous description have resulted from these inspections. As a consequence of these seizures, many prosecutions have been instituted, and fines amounting to about 100*l.* have been inflicted.

The Weekly Sales of Fat Stock have, as heretofore, been constantly supervised. During the year, only four animals were seized as being unfit for food; these were subsequently condemned and destroyed. A very marked improvement has been recently noticeable in connection with the class of Stock exposed at these Sales. During the past few years, a considerable number in excess of those now reported were seized as being totally unfit for food, and the decrease in the number during the past year can only be looked upon as a satisfactory indication.

The sanitary condition of Shops in which food is exposed has been supervised by the visiting Veterinary Inspectors, in connection with their visits of systematic inspection in quest of unsound food. The result of the examinations of these premises has been such as to indicate the necessity for exercising supervision in this respect, and in a special Table appended, there are set forth the various insanitary conditions which have been found existing and immediately remedied.

TABLE I.
SHEWING the Number of Animals slaughtered ; also Carcases Seized and Condemned in the Slaughter-houses during the Year ; and the Weight of the Condemned Carcases.

Month.	Animals Slaughtered.					Carcases Seized and Condemned.					Weight of Condemned Carcases. (In lbs. avoird.)				
	Cattle.	Calves.	Pigs.	Sheep.	TOTAL.	Cattle.	Calves.	Pigs.	Sheep.	TOTAL.	Beef.	Veal.	Pork.	Mutton.	TOTAL.
January	3,450	349	1,062	22,528	27,389	6	2	—	6	14	3,649	71	—	208	3,928
February	2,372	253	642	13,590	16,857	10	2	—	5	17	5,508	79	—	222	5,809
March	3,040	318	584	14,313	18,255	24	5	1	11	41	11,975	164	228	501	12,868
April	2,741	388	645	14,967	18,741	15	5	1	14	35	6,675	161	70	509	7,415
May	2,407	324	557	12,941	16,229	16	1	1	10	28	7,783	50	120	480	8,433
June	2,327	298	465	12,789	15,879	12	2	—	8	22	5,585	68	—	270	5,923
July	2,553	331	494	15,400	18,778	13	1	—	9	23	6,893	33	—	297	7,223
August	1,947	321	382	14,916	17,566	3	3	—	7	13	1,754	101	—	250	2,105
September	2,483	544	480	19,344	22,851	14	3	2	9	28	6,762	98	244	347	7,451
October	2,404	201	269	18,032	20,906	18	2	1	8	29	9,573	82	70	321	10,046
November	2,351	305	717	15,288	18,661	13	3	1	6	23	6,411	151	10	183	6,815
December	2,829	407	934	17,696	21,866	20	5	3	11	39	8,905	172	266	507	9,850
	30,904	4,039	7,231	191,804	233,978	164	34	10	104	312	81,473	1,230	1,068	4,095	87,866
				Add parts condemned for injuries, etc.					—	—	1,089	24	—	194	1,307
										TOTALS	82,562	1,254	1,068	4,289	89,173

APPENDIX No. 3—*continued*.

TABLE II.

Shewing the Diseases found in the Carcases seized in the Slaughterhouses and throughout the City

Disease.	Cows.	Bulls.	Bullocks.	Heifers.	Calves.	Pigs.	Sheep.	TOTALS.
Tuberculosis - - - - -	62	3	31	5	1	3	—	105
Decomposition - - - - -	—	—	1	—	1	1	21	24
Enteritis - - - - -	2	—	2	—	31	3	7	45
Asphyxia - - - - -	1	2	3	—	1	—	24	31
Dropsy - - - - -	4	—	—	—	—	—	13	17
Emaciation - - - - -	11	—	2	—	—	1	33	47
Septicæmia - - - - -	20	—	—	—	—	—	2	22
Metritis - - - - -	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Injuries - - - - -	1	—	—	—	—	—	5	6
Pyrexia - - - - -	9	—	1	—	—	—	2	12
Pneumonia - - - - -	6	—	—	—	—	1	1	8
Icterus - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Gastritis - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Peritonitis - - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Dystokia - - - - -	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Pericarditis - - - - -	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Mastitis - - - - -	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Swine Fever - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Edema - - - - -	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
TOTALS - - -	125	6	41	5	34	11	109	331

TABLE III.

SHEWING the extent of Infection in Condemned Tuberculous Carcases

	LUNGS.			HEART AND PERICARDIUM.			PLEURE.			LIVER.			SPLEEN.			BOWELS.			PERITONEUM.			UDDER.			OTHER ORGANS.				LYMPHATIC GLANDS.			
	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	Larynx.	Kidneys.	Uterus.	Bladder.	Slightly.	Considerably.	Severely.	
Animals with one organ affected.	1	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	6	12	5	2	15	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Animals with two organs affected.	3	6	7	—	2	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	2	7	3	—	1	—	5	2	—	1	2	—	3	5	—	6	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Animals with four organs affected.	2	10	4	—	—	—	1	10	5	2	1	—	—	—	—	3	7	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	3	10	2	—	2	—	3	9	3	8	5	2	4	9	1	1	5	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Animals with six organs affected.	1	4	5	—	6	—	1	2	7	6	3	1	—	8	2	1	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	18	50	31	—	11	—	16	48	22	22	14	3	5	20	3	11	35	14	12	21	18	—	3	1	2	1	5	1	8	48	10	4
99	99			11			86			39			28			60			51			4			9				66			4

APPENDIX No. 3—continued.

TABLE IV.

SHEWING Seizures of Meat, &c., exposed for sale, or in transmission for sale, and the proceedings taken.

WHERE SEIZED.	DESCRIPTION.	Weight in lbs. avoir.	No. Pro- ceed- ings.	Con- victed.	Ac- quitted.	Fines Imposed.		
						£	s.	d.
In Provision Shop - - -	1 Ox Head - - - -	25	—	1	—	2	—	—
On Lorry in Fountainbridge- -	1 Buli Carcase - - - -	366	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Sheep Carcase - - - -	48	—	1	—	15	—	—
Central Meat Market - - -	7 Pairs Rabbits - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Sheep Carcase - - - -	56	—	—	—	5	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	Apples - - - -	10	1	—	—	—	—	—
Edinburgh Meat Market - -	14 Pairs Rabbits - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Box Chickens - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fountainbridge - - -	1 Pig Carcase - - - -	26	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Ox Carcase - - - -	438	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	$\frac{1}{2}$ Barrel Apples - - - -	66	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Sheep Carcase - - - -	25	—	1	—	2	—	—
Central Meat Market - - -	1 Rabbit - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	50 Bananas - - - -	8	1	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	Hamper of Apples - - - -	50	—	1	—	2	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Cow Carcase - - - -	336	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Provision Shop - - -	30 Herrings - - - -	8	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Ox Carcase - - - -	436	1	—	—	—	—	—
On Lorry in Fountainbridge- -	1 Bull Carcase - - - -	560	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fish Shop - - -	Fish - - - -	3	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Grocer's Shop - - -	23 Tins Meat - - - -	23	1	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	1 Piece Bacon - - - -	12	—	1	—	3	—	—
In Fried Fish Shop - - -	56 Haddocks - - - -	12	—	—	1	—	—	—
„ „ - - -	37 „ - - - -	14	—	1	—	—	10	—
„ „ - - -	252 „ - - - -	40	—	—	1	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	1 Box Onions - - - -	75	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Grocer's Shop - - -	1 Piece Ham - - - -	7	—	1	—	Admonished		
In Poultry Shop - - -	3 Rabbits - - - -	—	—	1	—	3	—	—
In Provision Shop - - -	21 Herrings - - - -	5	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruiterer's Shop - - -	24 Baskets Strawberries - -	24	—	1	—	3	—	—
In Provision Shop - - -	1 Piece Ham - - - -	4	1	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	4 „ - - - -	8	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Butcher's Shop - - -	3 Pieces Mutton- - - -	6	—	1	—	3	—	—
In Provision Shop - - -	Sausage Roll - - - -	2	—	1	—	5	—	—
Edinburgh Meat Market - -	23 $\frac{1}{2}$ Pairs Rabbits - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	1 Sheep Carcase - - - -	34	—	1	—	3	—	—
Central Meat Market - - -	8 Pairs Rabbits - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fish Shop - - -	1 Box Fish - - - -	50	—	1	—	Admonished		
In Butcher's Shop - - -	1 Rabbit - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	Beef and Mince, etc. - - - -	46	—	1	—	2	—	—
	Carried forward - - -	2823	23	14	2	48	10	—

APPENDIX No. 3.—continued.

TABLE IV.—continued.

WHERE SEIZED.	DESCRIPTION.	Weight (in lbs. avoir.)	No Pro- ce- d- ings.	Con- vict- ed.	Ac- quitted.	Fines Imposed.		
						£	s.	d.
	Brought forward -	2823	23	14	2	48	10	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	Tomatoes - - -	5	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Central Meat Market - -	5 Pairs Rabbits - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	13 „ - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	Tomatoes - - -	6	1	—	—	—	—	—
Central Meat Market - -	8 Pairs Rabbits - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Edinburgh Meat Market - -	10 „ - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Confectioner's Shop - -	Toffy - - -	5	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	1 Hamper Apples - - -	20	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Grocer's Shop - - -	1 Roll Bacon - - -	12	—	1	—	—	10	—
Edinburgh Meat Market - -	10 Pairs Rabbits - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
In Fruit Shop - - -	1 Box Pears - - -	20	—	1	—	Admonished		
„ - - -	Fruit, etc. - - -	175	—	—	—	—	—	—
In Flesh Market Close - -	77½ Pairs Rabbits - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Central Meat Market - -	1 Ox Carcase - - -	446	—	—	—	—	—	—
On Lorry in Ponton Street - -	1 Sheep Carcase - - -	67	—	1	—	5	—	—
In Butcher's Shop - - -	3 Pieces Beef - - -	60	—	—	—	—	—	—
„ - - -	Minced Beef - - -	10	—	1	—	3	—	—
Waverley Station - - -	4 Qrs. Beef - - -	536	—	1	—	10	—	—
Leith Walk Station - - -	1 Ox Carcase - - -	500	1	—	—	—	—	—
For concealing disease in an Ox Carcase a butcher was fined -		—	—	—	—	30	—	—
	TOTAL - -	4685	33	19	2	97	—	—

APPENDIX No. 3.—continued.

TABLE V.

Shewing Seizures of Meat, &c., in possession, but Not exposed for Sale.

WHERE SEIZED.	DESCRIPTION.	WEIGHT. (in lbs. avoird.)
In Frozen Meat Store - - - - -	16 Ox Kidneys - - - - -	16
In Glen Street - - - - -	Haddocks - - - - -	20
In Bakehouse - - - - -	Lard - - - - -	94
In Cured Fish Store - - - - -	12 boxes Fish - - - - -	1236
Do. - - - - -	4 boxes Fish - - - - -	48
Do. - - - - -	18 boxes Fish - - - - -	216
In Frozen Meat Store - - - - -	1 piece Beef - - - - -	23
In Cured Fish Store - - - - -	7 boxes Fish - - - - -	84
Waverley Station - - - - -	2 quarters Mutton - - - - -	35
In Foulis Close - - - - -	1 box Fish - - - - -	70
New Street Station - - - - -	5 barrels Plums - - - - -	840
In Frozen Meat Store - - - - -	12 Sheep Plucks - - - - -	15
In Cured Fish Store - - - - -	3 boxes Fish - - - - -	40
Do. - - - - -	24 boxes Fish - - - - -	336
In Fruit Shop - - - - -	Tomatoes - - - - -	5
On N.B. Railway Lorry - - - - -	10 boxes Fish - - - - -	200
	TOTAL - - -	3278

TABLE VI.

Shewing Seizures of Live Animals, under Section 43 of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897.

CONSIGNEE FROM	WHERE SEIZED.	DESCRIPTION.	No Pro- ceed- ings.	Con- victed.	Ac- quitted.	Fines Imposed.		
						£	s.	d.
North Berwick -	Oliver & Son's Fat Stock Sale -	1 Live Cow - -	—	1	—	10	—	—
Leith - - - -	" / " - -	1 " - -	1	—	—	—	—	—
Dunfermline - -	Haymarket Station -	1 " - -	1	—	—	—	—	—
Davidson's Mains -	Swan & Son's Fat Stock Sale -	1 " - -	1	—	—	—	—	—
		4	3	1	—	10	—	—

APPENDIX No. 3—continued.

SUMMARY of Meat, &c., seized in the City during the year.

Where Seized.	Weight (in lbs. avoird.).						
	Beef.	Veal.	Pork.	Mutton.	Fish.	Fruit.	Total.
Carcases condemned at slaughter-house - -	81,473	1,230	1,068	4,095	—	—	87,866
Parts condemned for injuries, &c. - - -	1,089	24	—	194	—	—	1,307
In possession, but not exposed for sale - -	133	—	—	50	2,250	845	3,278
Exposed, or in transmission for sale - -	3,761	23	69	236	143	448	4,680
Total throughout the City - - -	86,456	1,277	1,137	4,575	2,393	1,293	97,131

The following Visits were paid to Shops, &c., during the Year.

	Number of Visits.
Butchers' Shops - - - - -	1,710
Provision Shops - - - - -	3,191
Fishmongers' Shops - - - - -	583
Fruiterers' Shops - - - - -	1,499
Warehouses - - - - -	26
Sausage Factories - - - - -	20
Cattle Markets - - - - -	104
Live Stock Sales - - - - -	104
Cured Fish Stores - - - - -	310
Railway Stations - - - - -	1,144
TOTAL - - -	8,691

APPENDIX No. 3—continued.

TUBERCULOSIS in Cows.

	Number of Cows.
Total number of Cows slaughtered during the year - - - - -	231
Total number condemned for Tuberculosis - - - - -	62
Being a proportion of the total number of Cows slaughtered of - - - - -	26·84 per cent.
Or a proportion of the total Bovine species slaughtered of - - - - -	0·29 ,
There had been consigned from the City - - - - -	28
There had been consigned from beyond the City - - - - -	34
Number of cases where Udders were Tuberculous - - - - -	5
Or a proportion of the total Cows affected of - - - - -	8·064 per cent.
Cows with Tuberculous Udders supplying Edinburgh with Milk—	
From the City Byres - - - - - 2	
From beyond the City - - - - - 2	
	4
Both those from the City Byres were ordered out by the Inspector.	
Cows with Tuberculous Udders not supplying Edinburgh with Milk - - - - -	1

The following gives approximately the quantities of Beef, Mutton, Pork and Veal, brought into the City from abroad, for the year 1903 :—

	Number of Carcases.
Beef, American, Port killed - - - - -	2,500
Beef, Chilled and Frozen - - - - -	2,500
Mutton and Lamb, River Plate and New Zealand - - - - -	29,500
Pork, American chilled - - - - -	7,500
Veal, Dutch - - - - -	1,600
TOTALS - - - - -	43,600

APPENDIX No. 4.

PAPER handed in by the *Chairman*.

A.—PAPER supplied by the Legal Adviser to the French Embassy.

COPY OF ARTICLE 81 OF THE FINANCE LAW OF FRANCE, 1898.

“ 81. Dans le cas de saisie de viande pour cause de tuberculose, des indemnités seront accordées aux propriétaires qui se seront conformés aux prescriptions des lois et règlements sur la police sanitaire.

“ Le montant de cette indemnité sera égal à la moitié de la valeur de la viande saisie en cas de tuberculose *généralisée*, aux trois quarts de cette valeur dans le cas de *tuberculose localisée*.

“ L'indemnité sera égale à la totalité de la valeur de l'animal abattu par mesure administrative s'il résulte de l'abatage que cet animal n'était pas atteint de tuberculose. Dans le dernier cas, la valeur de la viande vendue par les soins du propriétaire, sous le contrôle du maire, sera déduite de l'indemnité prévue.”

B.—STATEMENT supplied by the Netherland Consul General for Great Britain and Ireland.

The Netherland Government pays compensation for meat condemned abroad which before export from the Netherlands has been examined and approved by Government Inspectors, and which as a proof thereof bears a Government label.

Should such a carcase on arrival in this country be condemned, proof of confiscation is required, and by arrangement with the authorities of the Central Meat Market the labels of confiscated animals are detached and sent to this Consulate General. The labels bear marks and numbers by means of which it is possible to at once trace all particulars about the carcase condemned.

All Government Meat Inspectors must be duly-qualified veterinary surgeons.

APPENDIX No. 5.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *James King*.

The following TABLES show the result of the post-mortem examinations of 1,738 Animals, consisting of Cows, Bulls, Oxen, Heifers, and Calves, made by James King, M.R.C.V.S., in the Metropolitan Cattle Market, with the object of ascertaining, as nearly as possible, the percentage of cattle affected with tuberculosis, the loss to the country and the quantity of meat rendered useless to all concerned :—

TABLE I.

Number.	Cows.	Per Cent.	Bulls.	Per Cent.	Oxen.	Per Cent.	Heifers.	Per Cent.	Calves.	Per Cent.	Total.
Carcases and organs examined -	500	—	113	—	131	—	53	—	941	—	1,738
Carcases free from disease - -	266	53·2	93	82·3	116	88·85	42	79·24	929	98·72	—
Carcases tuberculous - - -	234	46·8	20	17·7	15	11·45	11	20·75	12	1·27	292
Carcases with lesions in abdominal and thoracic regions.	129	25·8	9	7·96	9	6·87	8	15·09	—	—	155
Carcases with lesions thoracic region only.	87	17·4	7	6·19	3	2·29	3	5·09	—	—	100
Carcases with lesions abdominal region only.	18	3·6	4	3·0	3	2·29	—	—	—	—	25
Carcases with lesions in mammary glands.	11	2·2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
Carcases with lesions in testicles	—	—	1	·87	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Carcases affected - - - -	67	13·4	5	4·42	6	4·58	5	9·43	5	·53	88
Carcases totally destroyed - -	35	7·0	3	2·66	1	·76	1	1·88	2	·21	42
Carcases partially destroyed -	32	6·4	2	1·77	5	3·81	4	7·54	3	·21	46

NOTE—All percentages calculated on the number of carcasses examined.

TABLE II.

Weights and Value of Meat and Viscera Destroyed.

	Weight of meat in lbs.	Price lb.	— £ s. d.	No. of whole Viscera destroyed.	Price each.	— £ s. d.	No. of abdominal organs destroyed.	Price each.	— £ s. d.	No. of thoracic organs destroyed.	Price each.	— £ s. d.	Total Value.
Cows	-	-	4	129	s. d. 16 6	£ s. d. 280 10 8	18	s. d. 14 0	£ s. d. 12 12 0	87	s. d. 2 6	£ s. d. 10 17 6	£ s. d. 410 8 8
Bulls	-	4½	44 11 0	9	16 6	7 8 6	4	14 0	2 16 0	7	2 6	0 17 6	55 13 0
Oxen	-	5½	26 8 0	9	16 6	7 8 6	3	14 0	2 2 0	3	2 6	0 7 6	36 6 0
Heifers	-	5½	17 2 10	8	16 6	6 12 0	—	—	—	3	2 6	0 7 6	24 2 4
Calves	-	4½	9 0 0	2	5 6	0 11 0	10	2 6	1 5 0	2	3 6	0 7 0	11 3 0
Total	21,288	—	377 12 6	—	—	128 8 6	—	—	18 15 0	—	—	12 17 0	537 13 0

The following TABLES show the number of animals slaughtered at the Metropolitan Cattle Market during the years 1901 and 1903 :—

1901.

Cattle.	Calves.	Sheep.	Pigs.	Total.
18,932	8,781	100,945	39,279	167,939

Of which the undermentioned were found unfit for human food and destroyed :—

Whole Carcases.		Carcases partially destroyed.	
Cows	750	Cows	258
Heifers	14	Oxen	6
Oxen	12	Bulls	2
Bulls	9	Sheep	5
Calves	9	Pigs	4
Sheep	91		—
Pigs	62		275
	947	TOTAL	1,222

750 of the above were destroyed owing to their being affected with tuberculosis, but many were cows which were bought at speculative prices, and upon which, in my opinion, no compensation should be paid.

1903.

Cattle.	Calves.	Sheep.	Pigs.	Total.
13,639	6,224	88,571	36,385	144,819

CONDEMNED.

Whole Carcases.		Carcases partially destroyed.	
Cows	369	Cows	228
Heifers	1	Bulls	3
Oxen	7	Sheep	6
Bulls	2	Pigs	18
Calves	9		—
Sheep	75		255
Pigs	203		—
	666	TOTAL	921

558 of the above were destroyed owing to their being affected with tuberculosis.